

A
DIVINE ANTIDOTE

Against a

Devilish POYSON,

O R, A

Scriptural Answer to an Anti-Scriptural
and Heretical Pamphlet,

ENTITLED

A designed End to the Socinian Controversie;

Written by JOHN SMITH.

Answered by FRANCIS GREGORY, D. D.
and Rector of *Hambleden* in the County of *Bucks*.

*False Teachers shall privily bring in damnable Heresies,
even denying the Lord that bought them, 2 Pet. 2. 1.
Be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about
with every wind of doctrine, by the slight of men,
and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to
deceive. Eph. 4. 14.*

Homines bonæ fidei non credunt Hæreticis, sed quid eis
respondeant, diligenter inquirunt. Augustinus de Genesi
contra Manichæos. Tom. 1, p. 180.

Πᾶσι Αἱρετικῇ ἑρμηνείᾳ, καὶ ἐν Διαβόλῳ πύφλωσι.
Epiphanius Hær. 75. p. 904.

L O N D O N :

Printed for *Rich. Ware*, and *Jos. Windmarsh*, at
Gray's Inn Gate in *Holborn*, and at the *Golden Ball*
over against the *Royal Exchange* in *Cornhil*. 1696.

DI VINE ANTI DOTE

1874

Christiansburg, Va. 24016

ENTITLED

Printed by J. H. Smith, at the Press of the American Book Company, New York.

I have been thinking of you very much lately, and wondering how you are getting on. I hope you are well and happy. I have been very busy lately, but I have managed to find some time to write to you. I have been thinking of you very much lately, and wondering how you are getting on. I hope you are well and happy. I have been very busy lately, but I have managed to find some time to write to you.

TO THE
Christian Reader.

WHAT St. Paul told his ^{1 Cor. 11.}
Converts in the Church ^{19.}
of Corinth, might, with
equal certainty, be said to
all Churches whatsoever, There must be
Heresies among you: Our Lord's Prophecy ^{Matth. 24.}
must be fulfilled, Many false Prophets shall
rise, and deceive many. St. Peter also ^{2 Pet. 2.1.}
tells us, There shall be false Teachers among
you. So long as there shall be a malicious
Devil in Hell, and Men of corrupt Judg-
ments on Earth, the Providence of God
for wise Ends so permitting, there will
never be a want of his Instruments to
raise Heresies, Sects, and Factions, and
to defend and spread them too.

The Words, Heresie and Sect, were at
first of a middle and indifferent use, sig-
nifying any Profession or Opinion, whether
good or bad. By these names the whole
Christian Religion hath been stiled, and

To the Christian Reader.

that by very judicious Men; 'tis called by
Euseb. Hitt. Eccl. l. 10. c. 5. *Eusebius, Τῆς αἰρετικῆς πίστεως, the Faith of*
Tert. ad Scapul. c. 1. p. 68. *the Christian Heresie; and the Profession*
Cyprianus in Præfat. l. 3. ad Quirin. p. 260. *of this Faith Tertullian calls, Hanc*
Sectam, this Sect. Sectam nostram,
our Sect; so St. Cyprian.

But in process of time both these words
Aug. in Præfat. ad l. de Hær. T. 6. p. 3. *came to be used in an ill Sense only; and so*
by the word, Heresie, is meant, as St. Au-
stin tell us, Non omnis error, not every
mistake in matters of Religion; but as
Ravanellus well defines it, Pertinax error
labefactans aut evertens fundamentum
fidei, such an error, as, being obsti-
nately defended, tends to shake or overturn
some Fundamental Article of the Chri-
stian Faith.

Aug. de Civit. l. 18. c. 51. *Accordingly St. Austin describes He-*
reticks thus, Qui in Ecclesia Christi
morbidum aliquid pravumque rapi-
unt; si correpti resistunt contumaci-
ter, suaque pestifera & mortifera Dog-
mata emendare nolunt, sed detensare
persistunt, Hæretici fiunt; Such as hold
unsound and wicked Opinions within the
Church of Christ, if they obstinately resist
all good Admonitions, and will not re-
nounce their Pestilent and deadly Do-
ctrines, but persist in defending them,
such Men are and ought to be esteemed Here-
ticks.

And

To the Christian Reader.

And what is the danger of Heresie, we learn both from God and Man; I will not say, as Maldonate doth, who, comparing Hereticks to the Tares in the Parable, determines positively thus, *Maturè sunt evellenda, maturè comburenda*, They are very speedily to be rooted out and burnt. And so elsewhere, *Comburendi, tanquam Proditores ac Transfugæ discedentes Hæretici*, Hereticks ought to be burnt as Traytors to, and Deserters of the Christian Faith. But St. Chrysostom was of another mind, 'Οὐ δὲ ἀποκτεῖν Αἰρετικόν, we must not kill an Heretick; but what then? How may we treat them? *Κατέχειν, ἐπιτομίζειν, ἔειπναι αὐτοῖς τὸ πᾶρρησιον*, &c. We may and ought to restrain them, to stop their mouths, to check their boldness, &c. Not to destroy, but convert them. Thus St. Austin, *Dominus emendandos potius, quàm perdendos jubet*: 'Tis our Lord's command, that Hereticks should rather be reformed, than ruined.

Maldonnt.
in Mat. 13.
26.

Idem in
Luc. 9. 54.

Chrysost.
in Mat. 13.
30.

Aug. contra
Epist.
Manichæi,
T. 6. p. 25.

But yet Ecclesiastical Laws have deservedly punished obstinate Hereticks as far as the Churches Authority could reach, *Ἀναθεμακαθάραι πάντοτε ἀπεσιν δὲ*, every Heretick ought to be Excommunicated; and that being done, *Μὴ συγχωρεῖν τοῖς Αἰρετικῶσι εἰσέραι εἰς τὸν οἶκον τῷ Θεῷ*, 6.

Concil.
Constant.
Can. 1.
Concil.
Laod. Can.
6.

To the Christian Reader.

Concil.
ejusdem,
Can. 33.

Concil.
ejusdem,
Can. 31.

Balsam, in
Can. 25.
Concil.
Carthag.

Blaftaris
Syntag.
p. 17.

Hereticks must not be permitted to enter into the House of God. Nay, 'Ου δὲ Ἀπεικὼ σὺνδύχου, No Man must any where join in Prayer with an Heretick. Surely these Spiritual punishments were very sore ones; yet these alone must not serve the Hereticks turn, but they lay under Temporal Censures too. 'Ου δὲ πρὸς πρῶτα Αἰρετικὸν ἐνγαμίαι ποιῶν, ἢ δίδου υἱὸς ἢ θυγατέρας. No Man or Woman may Marry an Heretick, nor give their Sons or Daughters to any such. And as to their Estates. Μὴ μόνον κληρονομή, ἀλλὰ ἔ λαικὸς ἐμποδίζεσθαι τοῖς Αἰρετικοῖς πρὸς πᾶσι πῦναι τὰ διαφύεσθαι, &c. No Man might give or transfer an Estate, or bequeath any Legacy to an Heretick, though he were of all relations the nearest.

These Canons were not only ratified by the Imperial Laws, but upon some Hereticks severer punishments were inflicted by them. Μανιχαῖοι ἐ Δοιολογία ἐγγίττωι κηρωπαῖσθαι. Let the Manichees and the Donatists suffer the extremest of all punishments, and that is death, for so another Law explains it. Μανιχαῖοι, εἰ ὦν Ρωμαιοῖς τῶν ὁφείλων δαίμων, δαπνιμνίσθαι, Decolletur, If any Manichee be seen within the Roman Empire, let him lose his head. And amongst other Hereticks the Civil Law took particular notice of the Arians,
and

To the Christian Reader.

and other Anti-Trinitarians, whom it censures thus, Ὁ μὴ δοξάζων τὴν ἁγίαν τριάδα Idem ib.
ὁ μὴ Θεοῦ μετ' ἰσότητος, ἢ ἡγεμονίας
ἀγνοῶν, ὁ ἄφρον ἐστίν, ὁ ἀπεικός, ὁ ἀκ-
μυς, καὶ ἐμωπῆται. He, who doth not think
the Holy Trinity to be coequal in Power,
and in the same Godhead, deserves not to
be called a Christian, but is a mad Man, an
infamous Heretick, and stands obnoxious
to the just Censures of the Law.

And as the Laws of Men both Ecclesi-
astical and Civil did treat all obstinate He-
reticks with great severity, so doth the Di-
vine Law threaten them with greater. It
was St. Paul's command to Bishop Titus, Tit. 3. 10.
A man, that is an Heretick, after the
first and second admonition, reject, i. e.
dispute no more with him, give no more
ear to his Cavils and Objections, but Ex-
communicate him, give him over as one that
is incorrigible, and like to be lost for ever.
And indeed such a Man's case is very danger-
ous; for, St. Peter tells us, that Hereſie is, 2 Pet. 2.
Pernicious, destructive, and that in the 1. 2.
very highest degree; for, in the foregoing
Verse he stiles it, Damnable, and saith
expresly that Hereticks Bring upon them-
selves swift destruction.

St. Paul also ranks Hereſy amongst Gal. 5. 20,
the vilest Immoralities, such horrid^{21.}
Crimes, of which he saith, They who

To the Christian Reader.

do such things, shall not inherit the Kingdom of God. *A like intimation hath our Lord himself left us in his Parable of the Tares ; But what are they ?*

Theophyl. & Chryf. in Matt. 13. 25. *Ζιζάνια, αἱ Αἵρεσις, so one. Αἵρεσιν τὰ συνηγμένα, so another. These Tares are Heresies, and all they that embrace and defend them. Well, what becomes of*

Matth. 13. 30. *these Tares at length ? Bind them in bundles to burn them. It seems that gross Errors in Judgment are damnable as well as foul Errors in Practice, God Almighty being jealous of his Truths as well as of his Commands.*

Now since Heresy is indeed a thing of so great Danger, we are the more concerned to avoid both it and them, who are tainted with it. 'Tis our Saviour's caution, Beware of false Prophets, they are dangerous Men, Men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the Faith ; and what then ? From such turn away. And verily there is great reason for it ; for Heresy is like a Leprosy, a Leprosy in the Head, not only deforming and defiling the Person in whom it is, but spreading and infectious to other Men.

Matth 7. 15.
2 Tim. 3. 8.
And there are two ways which Heretics are wont to take to spread their infectious Disease among their Neighbours.

They

To the Christian Reader.

1. They endeavoured to do it by personal Visits and private Discourses. *In this end, They creep into houses, and lead captive silly women, yea and silly men too; and how they do it, St. Paul tells us, By good words and fair speeches, they deceive the hearts of the simple. But though their Words seem never so fair, there's Poyson in them. They eat like a Canker, like a Gangrene, only with this difference, where the Canker eats, it also pains; but the Hereticks smooth and soft Language doth at once eat and please too. But as the Canker, if not timely prevented, spreads farther in the Flesh, so Heresy, if not restrained by Authority, and confuted by solid Arguments, is apt to grow till it become Epidemical.*

We may say of plausible Heresies, what St. Paul saith of pleasant Vices, A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. An Error or two not restrained, a small number of Hereticks being indulged and permitted freely to converse with Men, may prove enough by fallacious, yet specious Arguments to pervert even the whole Neighbourhood. For there is no sort of Men more affable, more condescending, and more colloquing than they; and they have great reason so to be, for if once by fawning
and

¹ Tim. 3.

Rom. 16.
^{18.}

² Tim. 2.
^{17.}

¹ Cor. 5.6.

To the Christian Reader.

and flattering they can insinuate themselves into the Hearts of Men, they find it the easier Task by subtle Pretences, by gentle Steps and Degrees, to instil their cursed Opinions into their Heads too. But

2. The second Course which Hereticks take to divulge and spread their erroneous Doctrines, is by Writing and publishing Books, wherein they offer such seeming Arguments in defence of their ill Opinions, as the generality of Men know not how to answer.

This is the more speedy way which our modern Socinians take to gain greater numbers of Profelytes than can be got by private Conference; their printed Books being warily and closely written, and spread throughout the Nation, may, if not prevented, pervert multitudes of easy, flexible and unstabled Men, who are too apt to be Convinced by every Argument, which they themselves are not able to Confute.

To shake the Faith, and stagger the Minds of Orthodox Christians touching the Doctrine of the Glorious Trinity, there came out a little Book, which by mere Accident I met with. A Book stuffed with Blasphemous Falshoods, too much magnifying Humane Reason, abusing the Sacred Word of God, denying the Divinity of Christ,

To the Christian Reader.

Christ, and the Personality of the Holy Ghost. What Censure its Author deserves, let Authority judge; but I will venture to say that the Book itself doth both deserve and need the Flames; for 'tis so abominably foul, that nothing can purge it, save only that which consumes it too.

To this Book I expected a reply from some other hand; but in four or five Months none appearing, I thought that Time and Pains would not be lost, which should be spent in writing, and in publishing an Answer to it, as my health and leisure would permit.

This Book was first put into my hand by a very Eminent Citizen of London, who informed me that its Author is by Trade a Clock-maker. This being so, it may be thought a matter of no great Credit for a Divine of the Church of England to dispute a point of Faith against an illiterate Mechanick. But notwithstanding this, laying aside both hopes and fears of gaining or losing any Reputation thereby, I resolved to undertake it, that I might prevent that Mischief which this pestilent Book, by its false Pretences and Abuses of Scripture, might otherwise do among ignorant, easy, and perhaps well-meaning Christians. Nor indeed can I think

To the Christian Reader.

think it to be a thing of Dishonour, but rather an incumbent Duty to defend Truths, especially those of the highest Magnitude, by whomsoever they chance to be opposed.

Horatius
de Arte
Poetica.

But if I have not effectually done what I really designed to do, if my Arguments for Truth be not what I think they are, sufficient to confute this Man's Pretences for Error; the Doctrines which I have here asserted, being very deserving and capable of a just Defence; I hope that by this well intended, though weak Endeavour of mine, fungar vice cotis, &c. I may excite, whet, and set the keener Edge upon the Pen of some abler Divine, who may supply my Defects of better Arguments, and confound the whole Socinian Hypothesis, and all their subtle reasonings, by such clear Evidences as may prove Convincing and Unanswerable. In the mean time, good Reader, forget not to pray for the conversion of Hereticks, for the confirmation of all Orthodox Christians, and particularly for

Thy Friend in our

great Lord's Work,

F. G.

That

*That the Authors cited in this Tract might
the more easily be consulted, I thought fit
to give the Reader an Account of their
several Editions as to Time and Place.*

Paris. **A**quinas, 1638.
Aristotle, 1561.
Athanasius, 1627.
Augustinus, 1571.
Basilius M. 1518.
Cornelius à Lapid. 1631.
Cyprian, 1666.
Cyril of Jerusalem, 1631.
Dionysius Areop. 1615.
Elias Cretensis, 1630.
Epiphanius, 1622.
Estius, 1661.
Eusebius, 1659.
Gregorius Naz. 1630.
Gregorius Nyss. 1615.
Gregorius Thaum. 1622.
Irenæus, 1639.
Novatianus, 1664.
Occumenius, 1630.
Seneca, 1602.
Socrates, 1668.
Sozomen, 1668.
Tertullian, 1664.
Theophylact, 1635.

Lond.

- Annotations English*, 1651.
 Lond. { Aynsworth, 1639.
 { *Critici Sacri*, 1660.
 { Pearson, 1662.
 { Symphon's *History*, 1634.
 Colon. { Bellarminus, 1620.
 Agripp. { Pererius, 1622.
 { Pineda, 1613.
 Lugd. { Lorinus, 1609.
 { Maldonatus, 1598.
 { Chemnitius, 1634.
 Genev. { Junius & Trem. 1630.
 { Ravanellus, 1650.
 { Calvinus, 1617.
 { Cartwright, 1632.
 Amst. { Horatius, 1636.
 { Ignatius, 1646.
 { Vossius, 1646.
 Oxon. { *Concil. Pand.* 1672.
 { Usserius, 1660.
 Rothom. [*Huetius cum Origen.* 1668.
 { Chrysostomus, 1613.
 Etona. { Cœl. Rhodig. 1599.
 Basilee. [Hieronymus, 1516.

BOOKS

Books Printed for Richard Sire
and Joseph Hindmarsh.

Fables of Esop and other Eminent Mythologists, with Morals and Reflexions. Folio.

The Visions of Dom Francisco de Quevedo. Octavo.

Seneca's Morals. Octavo.

Erasmus's Colloquies. Octavo.

Tully's Offices. Twelves.

Bona's Guide to Eternity. Twelves.

All six by Sir Roger L' Estrange.

The Genuine Epistles of St. Barnabas, St. Ignatius, St. Clement, St. Polycarp, The Shepherd of Hermas, and the Martyrdoms of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp. Translated and Published with a large Preliminary Discourse, by W. Wake, D. D. Octavo.

A Practical Discourse concerning Swearing, by Dr. Wake. Octavo.

Compleat Sets, consisting of Eight Volumes of Letters, writ by a Turkish Spy, who lived forty five Tears undiscovered at Paris, giving an Impartial account to the Divan at Constantinople of the most remarkable Transactions of Europe during the said time. Twelves.

Humane

Humane Prudence, or, the Art by which a Man may raise himself and Fortune to Grandeur, the sixth Edition. Twelves.

Moral Maxims and Reflections in four Parts; written in French by the Duke of Rochefoucault, now made English. Twelves.

Epictetus's Morals, with Simplicius's Comment, made English from the Greek; by George Stanhop, late Fellow of King's-College Cambridge. Octavo.

The Parson's Councellor; or, the Law of Tythes; by Sir Simon Degge. Octavo.

Of the Art both of Writing and Judging of History, with Reflections upon Antient as well as Modern Historians; by the Learned and Ingenious Father Le Moyne. Twelves.

An Essay on Reason; by Sir George Mackenzie. Twelves.

The Unlawfulness of Bonds of Resignation. Octavo.

The Doctrine of a God and Providence; vindicated and asserted by Tho. Gregory, late of Wadham-College, Oxford; and now Lecturer near Fulham. Octavo.

Some Discourses on several Divine Subjects; by the same Author. Octavo.

Death made Comfortable, or the Way to Die well; by John Kettlewell, a Prebyter of the Church of England. Twelves.

THE FIRST
SECTION

Containing the
INTRODUCTION.

THE Author of this little Tract designed thereby, as its Title imports, to put a full end to the *Socinian* Controversy; an excellent Design, were it rightly intended, fairly managed, and well accomplished. The main thing concerned in this Controversy is the *Divinity* of *Christ* and his *Holy Spirit*, both which our *Socinians* deny, and we assert.

This Dispute began betimes, even betwixt our *Lord* himself and the *Jews*, who, being blind and prepossess'd with prejudice against his *Person*, his *Doctrine*, his *Miracles*, and his *Conversation* too, denied him to be the promised *Messias*, and the Son of God. And when

B

our

Job. 10.
33.

our Lord had affirm'd himself to be both, they attempted to stone him, and gave him this Reason for it, *Because thou being a man, a mere man, as they thought, makest thy self God*, here was, though not a *Verbal*, yet an *Interpretative* and practical denial of our Lord's Divinity.

Amongst the Jews was *Ebion*, and besides him that Villain *Cerinthus*, who held and endeavoured to propagate the same Cursed Opinion, which gave St. *John* a just occasion to write that Holy Gospel of his, wherein by such plain Arguments, as can never be fairly answered, he hath infallibly proved that our blessed Saviour is truly *God*.

But notwithstanding all the Evidences of our Lord's Divinity, which had been given by Prophets, Evangelists or Apostles, there was still a sort of men, who, because they could not reconcile this mysterious Doctrine to their own corrupted and shallow Reason, resolved to oppose and dispute against it. And by this means the Peace of the Christian Church was so much disturb'd, that the good Emperour *Constantine* the Great thought it necessary to summon an *Oecumenical Council* to determine this so grand a Controversy.

In

In this first General Council of *Nice*, which consisted of 318 Bishops, the Doctrine of our Lord's *Divinity* and *Consubstantiality* with his Father was discussed, and after mature deliberation, and the strictest enquiries into the Word of God, which those Bishops were as likely to understand as any men of that or after Ages, was *approved* and *established* as sound and Orthodox; very few of that great number dissenting, and most of those few, upon second thoughts, subscribing to it.

But this almost unanimous Consent of this famous Council did not end this Controversy; for, in a short time it was revived, and hath been ever since more or less carried on, in several Ages, by men of several denominations; they, who were once called *Ebionites*, *Arians*, *Phocinians*, *Sabellians*, *Macedonians*, and afterwards *Socinians*, do now distinguish themselves by a new Character, and without all reason, usurp and appropriate to the men of their own Opinion the Name of *Unitarians*, as if we, who believe a *Trinity* of *Persons*, did also believe a *Trinity* of *Gods*.

And here we do willingly acknowledge, that some of those Persons, who formerly did, and yet do, oppose the

Doctrine of the Trinity, were and still are Men of Parts and Learning ; but it is too hard a task for the ablest Person to *defend* a *falsehood*, and to maintain a foul matter by fair pretences ; and such a matter is that Opinion, for which these Men contend ; so gross an Error, so contrary to Divine Revelation, that it is somewhat of wonder, that any Man of Parts and Piety should ever espouse, countenance and own it

But altho' it hath been so, though some Learned Men have put their Understanding to the very utmost stretch to invent Pretences against our Lord's Divinity ; yet the strongest Arguments which their most subtle Disputants have ever raised either from Scripture or Reason, have been fairly answer'd and clearly baffled by the judicious Writers of the Catholick Church.

And yet the Enemies of this important Truth being Men of presuming and restless Spirits, the Controversy hath been continued and prosecuted ; tho' not with equal Vigour, from one Generation to another : But now, in this Age of ours, there hath unexpectedly started up, tho' not dropt down from the Clouds, a Man who intends to do great Wonders ; I mean to put an
end

end to that Controversy, which hath lasted and perplexed the Christian Church so many hundred Years.

Now, one would think, that he, who undertakes this Noble, but Difficult Work, should be a Person of rare Endowments, an incomparable Scholar, an excellent Textuary, a very choice Critick in the Original Languages of his Bible, well versed in School-Divinity, and such an acute Disputant, that the poor baffled *Trinitarians*, being clearly convinced by the irresistible Strength of his Arguments, submitting to his better Judgment, may all at once come over as *Profelytes* to his Opinion, and for ever acquiesce in his uncontrollable Determinations,

Such a Man, and so qualified, this very assuming *Socinian* Champion should be ; but pray, who is it ? he calls himself, if his Printer do not Nick-name him, *John Smith*, and truly, as the Poet observes, *Conveniunt rebus nomina saepe suis*, this Person's Name is apposite enough ; and somewhat of kin to his Occupation ; for, I am inform'd by an Eminent Citizen of *London*, whom I have great Reason to believe, that this great Undertaker and Reconciler, is by Trade a *Clock-maker*, and there-

fore a Man in all probability, who never had any thing of a liberal and learned Education; perhaps indeed some little Skill in the *Mathematicks* may be useful to him, in framing a Clock; but in his managing this great controverted Point of Divinity, as we do not expect any *Mathematical*; so neither can we find any *Logical* Demonstrations. And is it not an Instance of unparallel'd *presumption*, that an *illiterate Mechanick*, who should rather handle the *Smith's Hammer*, than the *Scholar's Pen*, should ever hope to produce stronger Reasons and clearer Texts to end this Controversy by disproving our Lord's Divinity, than any learned Men of his own Perswasion were ever yet able to do? Is it not a sign of intolerable *Arrogance*, that an unlearned *Tradesman* should be so highly conceited of his own Abilities, as to think himself sufficient to confute all the Arguments, which have been urged by General Councils, Ancient Fathers, and later Divines, even Men of incomparable Parts, to prove that our blessed Saviour is really and truly God? Certainly, *hic labor, hoc opus est*, it is a difficult Task indeed, but yet it must be done by him, who would end this Controversy; and whether

ther a *Clock-maker* be a likely Man to do so great a Work, let the Reader judge.

But, by the way, since in this unhappy Age of ours, we have good store of *Lay-Preachers*, it is the less wonder, that we now find some *Lay-Disputers* too; they, who had the face without any Steps and University Degrees *per Saltum*, to leap from the *Shop-board* into the *Minister's Pulpit*, may with equal right, invade the King's Divinity *Professor's Chair*; but of the two, it is an easier Adventure for a bold *Ignoramus* to *prate* in a Pulpit, as our *Apron Levites* did, where none opposed them, than to *Dispute* against any one learned Antagonist; 'tis but an easy thing for a Man of much assurance to *repeat* a *Sermon*, and probably some *other* Man's; but 'tis a much harder Task to *solve* and untie a knotty *Argument*: whether our *Clock-maker* be a *Preacher* or not, I cannot tell; but he hath undertook a more difficult Work, and ventured to *Dispute*, tho' not in *Mood* and *Figure*, yet in *Print*.

And now let us try his Strength, and consider whether he hath obtain'd his End, and according to his Design, brought the *Socinian* Controversy to

such a Conclusion, that there may be no room left for any more Disputes about that Matter.

S E C T. II.

THIS Author, in the very entrance of his Work and his first two Sections, makes it his only business to prove these two Propositions. 1. That there is a God. 2. That this True God is but one in Nature and Essence. Were this Man disputing against an *Atheist*, who thinks that there is *no God*; or against a *Pagan*, who thinks that there are *many*, the proof of these Propositions had been necessary; but in a Book levelled against us *Trinitarians* only, who own a God, and but one, it might have been spared. For, to what purpose should a Man take Pains, muster up Arguments, and cite several Texts, to confirm those Truths to us, who, being already convinced and satisfied about them; do acknowledge them as readily as he? That God is, and is but one, is a Truth so evident from the Light of Scripture, and right Reason too; that, as no *Christian* doth, so no intelligent *Heathen*, who improves and

and exerciseth his natural Understanding, can deny or doubt it, if this Author thinks us guilty of *Polytheism*, let him prove that Charge against us, if he can; but if he hath no such Thoughts concerning us, what need he have spent his two first Pages in confirming a Truth, which none of us, against whom he writes, ever did, nor can deny.

There must indeed be something of *Prudence* and *Policy* in beginning with these two granted Truths; that his Reader's mind, being prepossess'd and well seasoned with both these Preliminaries and well known *Verities* might be the less inclinable to suspect any *Falshood* in any of those Assertions, which are to follow; for a few *Truths*, intermingled amongst many *Errors*, seem like a little *Sugar* sprinkled amongst a greater quantity of *Ratsbane*, which renders the Poyson the more palatable, and tempts the silly and cheated Vermin to swallow it down so much the sooner.

But if this Author laid down these Truths, as the necessary Foundations of his future Buildings; sure I am, those *Superstructures*, which he hath thought fit to add, can never be cemented to them, nor stand firm upon them; for, the *Unity* of the *Godhead* is very consistent

sistent with the *Trinity* of those glorious *Persons*, whom we believe and worship.

But, in Opposition to this, our Author doth in express Terms lay down a third Proposition, namely this, *That this one true God is but one in Person*; and this, saith he, is evident; and truly if it be so indeed, it will do this Man's work: and according to his Design, it will bring the *Socinian* Controversy to an end; but if the Truth of this Proposition be indeed so *Evident*, as this Man makes it; How come so many thousand Persons, who had very good *Eyes* in their Heads, not to see it? How come we poor Men, to be so far mistaken, as to think this third Proposition to be as *False*, as the other two are *true*? The Scripture tells us that there is but *One* true God, and we believe it; the Scripture also tells us, *There are Three Persons that bear record in Heaven*; and why should we not believe that too?

And yet notwithstanding this and many other Texts, which clearly prove the *Trinity*, and notwithstanding the General Belief of the *Christian Church* concerning it, this *Heretical Clock-maker*, in despite of God and Man, makes
bold

bold to say, 'Tis Evident that God can in no sense be any more than one in Person.

This bold Assertion is not absolute and perfect *Atheism*, but 'tis somewhat like it, and a fair step towards it; it is a degree of *Atheism* to limit the Providence of God, and confine it, as some have done, to *Heaven*; and what is it less to limit the Personality of God, and to contract Three Persons into One? Verily, this Man, who doth so, had need secure himself upon the most infallible Grounds, that those two Persons, whom he thus excludes from the God-head, are but *imaginary*, such as have no Entity, save only in the Thoughts of deceived Men; for, if these Persons should at length prove *real Subsistences*, as millions of very understanding Persons formerly did, and still do believe; he, who *denieth*, and as far as he can, *dethrones* these Glorious Persons, may justly expect to feel the utmost severity of that Divine Vengeance, which is due to such horrid *Blasphemy* and *Impiety*.

And if this *Socinian Hypothesis*, if false, be certainly attended with the greatest Danger; then every Man who owns it, and valueth his own Soul, is highly

highly concerned by the most undeniable Arguments to make it good. The question then is, How comes this Author to be so fully satisfied about the Truth of this Assertion, as to publish his own Perswasion of it to the World, and as a publick Act of Charity to his Neighbours Souls, to recommend it to other Men? How doth he prove it? I answer two things,

1. To prove this bold Assertion, *That there is but one Person in the Godhead*, this great Pretender doth make no use of Scripture.

To prove some other of his Assertions, he doth sometimes quote great variety of places out of the Prophets, Evangelists and Apostles; but in this case, where he had most need to prove this, he doth not, because indeed he could not cite so much as one single Text. The Scriptures indeed do often tell us, that there is but *one God*; but they do no where tell us, that there is but *one Person in the Godhead*; nor can this be ever proved by any Consequences fairly drawn from Sacred Writ; for no Consequence can be Genuine, which contradicts the express Letter of those Texts, which are not *figurative*, and wherein the *Trinity* of Persons is clearly avouched.

2. To

2. To prove this bold Assertion, *That there is but one Person in the God-head*, this great Schoolman, or some body for him, makes use of an Argument drawn from some of God's *Attributes*, and naming three, he argues thus, *If the Divine Nature did contain in it several Persons, then each of those must be truly Immense, truly Almighty, and truly most Wise*: We grant it, and believe that the whole *Trinity* is so; but this Author thinks this impossible, and that impossibility he endeavours to illustrate by two Instances, relating to the *Omnipotence* and infinite *Wisdom* of God; and thus he Reasons;

Suppose, saith he, *two such beings as A and B*; now if the Person of *A* can do more than the Person of *B*, then the Person of *B* cannot do more than the Person of *A*; but hold a little, this Consequence is often false; for suppose by the Letter *A*, we should mean our Author, and by the Letter *B*, we should mean his Answerer, then the Argument must run thus, If this Author can do more than his Answerer, then his Answerer cannot do more than this Author. This Inference is manifestly untrue, for this Author can make a Clock, which is more than his Answerer

swerer can do ; and yet his Answerer can make some shift to understand *Greek* and *Latin* Authors ; which, I presume, is somewhat more than our *Clockmaker* can do.

But I am of Opinion that by *A.* and *B.* our Author intends two Persons by him only *supposed*, but by us firmly *believed* to subsist in the *Godhead*, I mean the *Father* and the *Son* ; now if this be his meaning, his Argument must run thus. If the Person of the Father can do more than the Person of the Son, then the Person of the Son cannot do more than the Person of the Father ; for if he could, then would not the Father be able to do more than the Son, and by consequence he could not be Almighty ; so reasons this *subtle Sophister*, but verily this way of argumentation is much to blame ; upon a double account : For,

1. Here is a plane ; *Petitio principii*, the begging of a question. He takes that for a granted *Truth*, and grounds his Argument upon it, which we believe and can prove to be a *Falscheed* ; he presumes and takes it, *pro concessio*, that the *Father* can do more than the *Son* ; which we deny.

2. Whereas

2. Whereas we affirm that the *Father* cannot do more than the *Son*, he subsumes, and saith, that then by consequence the *Father* cannot be *Almighty*.

But truly this *Gentleman*, if he seeth the necessity of this Consequence must have more and better Eyes, than ever *Argus* had; for cannot the *Father* be *Almighty* unless he can do more than the *Son*, who is *Almighty* too? It is the Belief of the Catholick Church, warranted either by expresse Texts, or evident Deductions from them, that the whole *Trinity* is one and the same *Almighty God*; Co-essential, and Co-equal, in Power, Wisdom, and all other Essential Perfections, which are natural to, and inherent in the Deity; whatever any one of them can do or know; every one of them can do and know.

But here perhaps this Author may thus reply, that by our equally ascribing the whole Divine Nature to the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, - we make three Gods as well as three Persons; perhaps he may say, as some have done before him, that as the humane Nature, being communicated to three distinct Persons, doth constitute three several Men; so the Divine Nature being communicated to three distinct Subsistences, must
needs

needs constitute *three* several *Gods*.

To this supposed Objection we answer thus; The forenamed Comparison, and the inference from it, are both naught; and so cannot hold; for, there is a vast difference in the Case, the *humane Nature* being *finite* and limited, cannot be communicated to *three Persons* without *separation*; and consequently where it is so communicated, it must of necessity constitute *three* several *Men*, whose Nature is, not *numerically*, but *specifically* the same. But with the *Divine Nature* it is not so; for, that being *infinite*, and *indivisible*, and entirely communicated to *three Persons*, *distinct* indeed, but not *divided*, doth not constitute *three* several *Gods*, for, the Divine Essence of each Person is not *specifically*, but *numerically* the same.

And from this *Unity* of their *Essence* ariseth the *Identity* of their Divine Attributes; they are alike in Power, alike in Wisdom, and so in all other essential Excellencies; so that notwithstanding this Author's absurd *Hypothesis*, the *Father* may be, and certainly is, both *Almighty* and *All-Wise*, tho' he cannot do nor know *more* than the Son; and the *Son* also may be, and certainly is, both *Almighty* and *All-Wise*, though he cannot

cannot do nor know *more* than the Father; so that this Man's Argument drawn from the Divine Attributes, doth no way prove that, for which he brings it, namely— That the True God is but *One* in Person.

S E C T. III.

THE next thing, which this Author attempts, is the proof of this Proposition, *That this One Person, who is truly God, is he only, who was the God of Israel, and is now called the Father of Jesus Christ.*— To which we answer thus,

That the God of *Israel* was and is the only True God, we easily grant; but that this God of *Israel* was and is but *One* in Person, we must not, without sufficient Proof, take this or any other Man's bare Word. 'Tis a very bold Assertion, and it is that, on which the force of all this Author's subsequent Arguments doth depend, and for that reason he was much obliged to prove it well; but therein he miserably fails.

The Texts, which he produceth out of the *Old Testament*, are such as these—
 2 Kings *Thou art God, and Thou alone*, and again,
 19 15. *I am God, and there is none else*— These,
 Esa. 46. 9. and some other Texts, which he cites, do only prove, what none of us deny, that the God of *Israel* was the *only* true God; but none of them prove that, for which he quotes them all, namely, that this true God of *Israel* was but *One* in *Person*. When God Almighty saith, *I am God, and there is none else*, that proves that there is no *other* God; but it doth not prove that there is but *one* *Person* in the Godhead; and when 'tis said, *Thou art God and thou alone*, 'tis not meant of one *Person* only, but of the whole *Trinity* took together. So thought that great Man *Athanasius*, who tells us, Το μόνον ὃν τῆς Θεότητος λαμβανόμενον, &c. i. This word *Alone*, when 'tis applied to the *Deity*, doth for the most part, imply the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, who are indeed the only true God. Nay, the word, *God*, being *absolutely* taken, when there is no reason in the Context to restrain it to any *one* particular *Person*, is generally, to be understood of the whole *Trinity*. As for instance, when *Moses* tells us,

Athanas.
dial. 3. de
Trin. p.
 223.

The

against a Devilish Poyson.

19

The Lord God said to Adam; St. *Austin* Aug. de Trin. l. 2: cap. 10. gives his Judgment thus, *Cur non ipsa Trinitas intelligatur, nihil dici potest.*

i. Why by these two Titles, the Lord God, the whole *Trinity* should not be understood, no reason can be assigned.

But this Author goeth on to prove, as well as he can, that the true God of *Israel* was only he, who is the *Father* of Jesus Christ; by whom he means, and so do we, the *first* Person in the Deity; but, by his favour, we do not believe that the *first* Person only is the true God, nor can he ever prove him so.

For, of those many Texts, which he cites out of the *New Testament* to prove that the *Father* of Christ alone, is truly God, there is but one, which doth so much as seem to give any Countenance, though indeed it gives none at all, to his Opinion. 'Tis that Expression of our Lord in his solemn Address to his Father; *Father, this is life eternal, that they may know thee the only true God; and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent:* John 17. 1. 3. suppose that this is the Text, upon which this Man doth principally depend, because he mentions it in his Title Page, and here cites it first; and

had he cited no more, he had shewed himself so much the wiser; for, all the other Scripture, to which he appeals, do, as to his present purpose, signify nothing.

And indeed, even this Text, rightly understood, as to his Design, signifieth as little; for our Lord doth not here say, as this man thinks, that his *Father only* is the true God; but that he *is*, which we readily grant, the *only true God*. Now, there is a very wide difference betwixt this Proposition, which the Text contains, *the Father is the only true God*; and this, which the Text contains not, *the Father only is the true God*; the former Proposition excludes from the Godhead only the *false* Gods of the Heathen World; but the latter, were it contained in the Text, would exclude the *Son* and the *Holy Ghost*, whose Deity we do justly own, and religiously adore.

This heretical Inference, which this man would force from this Text, is diametrically opposite to the Interpretations of such learned Men, whose Judgments are far to be preferred before that of an *illiterate Mechanick*. St. *Anselm* expounding these Words of Christ, infers his *Divinity* from them; for
thus

against a Devilish Poyson.

21

thus he tells us, *Ordo verborum est, ut Te, & quem misisti Jesum Christum, cognoscant unum verum Deum: i.e.* The Order, in which these words are to be understood is this, that they may know Thee, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent, to be the one true God; so that great Man.

Aug. de
Trin. l. 6.
c. 9. p. 75.
Tom. 3.

To the same purpose writes Tertul-
lian; *Si Christus nolisset se etiam Deum
intelligi, cur addidit, & quem misisti Je-
sum Christum? nisi quoniam & se Deum
accipi voluit? quoniam si se Deum intel-
ligi noluit, addidisset, & quem misisti ho-
minem Jesum Christum; nunc autem nec
addidit, nec se nobis hominem tantummodo
Christus tradidit, sed Deo junxit, ut &
Deum per hanc conjunctionem, sicut est, in-
telligi vellet—* If Christ would not have
had us understand him also to be God,
why did he add these Words; and Jesus
Christ whom thou hast sent?— for which
addition there could be no other rea-
son, save only this, because he would
have himself took for a God; for were
it not so, he would have added, and
the Man Christ Jesus, whom thou hast
sent; but he added no such thing, but
here joyned himself to God, that by
such a Conjunction we might under-
stand him to be, what indeed he is,
the true God: So Tertullian.

Tert. ci-
tatur a
Maldona-
to in loc.

And by this very Text, from which the *Socinians* draw their chiefest Argument against the Divinity of Christ, doth St. *Ambrose* prove it; for, our Lord here saith, *This is life eternal, that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent*; from whence 'tis evident that our eternal Life depends as well upon our knowledge of *Jesus Christ*, as upon our knowledge of *God the Father*; but how can that be, were *Jesus Christ* no more than a mere Man? So argues St. *Ambrose*.

Chrysost.
in loc.

Theophyl.
in loc.

To the same purpose do the *Greek Fathers* understand this Text; when our Lord calls his Father, *the only true God*; St. *Chrysostom* tells us, that he calls him so, *περὶ ἀντιδιαστολήν τῷ ἐκ ὄντων Θεῷ*, to distinguish his Father from the false Gods of the Heathen World, into which he intended shortly to send his Apostles. *Theophylact* expounds the same Text thus: *Μόνον ἀληθινόν Θεόν εἶπε τὸν πατέρα περὶ ἀντιδιαστολήν τῷ ψευδυνύμων παρ' ἑλλήσι Θεῷ*. ἔστι δὲ χωρίζων ἰσχυρὸν τῷ Πατρὶ; and again, *ἐπεὶ μόνος Θεὸς ὁ Πάτερ, ὁ υἱὸς ἐκ' ὅλων ἐκ Θεῶν, ὅντως ἀνοητὰ ταῦτα*; i. e. Our Lord here calls his Father, *the only true God*: not to exclude himself from being so, but to distinguish his Father from the

the *ſictitious* Gods of the *Grecians*; and whoſoever ſhall ſay, that Chriſt is not God, becauſe his Father is the *only* true one, ſpeaks like a very Fool: So *Theophylact*.

Concerning the ſame matters, that excellent Divine, *Gregory Nazianzen*, delivers his Opinion thus; I judge, ſaith he, that theſe Words, *That they may know thee the only true God*, were ſpoke by our Lord, *ἐπαναρίσει τῷ ἐκ ὁπίου μὴ Θεῷ, λεγομένων δέ.* To remove from the Deity thoſe *Idols*, which were then eſteemed to be Gods, but really were not ſo; for, ſaith he, our Lord would not here have mentioned himſelf, had he not, *by the only true God*, intended himſelf, as well as his Father. And therefore he thus concludes; *Ὅτι ἐπεὶ πατέρι, ἀλλὰ τῷ υἱῷ λεγόμενον, ἡ περὶ αὐτὴν σαφὲς παρίσται;* the addition of theſe Words, *And Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent*, doth evidently declare, that by *the only true God*, our Lord meant not his Father only, but *himſelf* too.

Nazianz.
Or. 36.
pag. 186.

For, as the ſame Father in the ſame Diſcourſe doth argue well; if this Expreſſion, *the only true God*, muſt be ſo reſtrained to the Father, as to exclude the Son; Why might not ſome other like Expreſſions, by a parity of Reaſon,

be restrained so too? 'Tis said, that
 Rom. 16. God, is only Wise, the only Potentate,
 27. He who only hath immortality; and our
 1 Tim. 6. Lord saith, There is none good, but one,
 15, 16. and that is God; shall we now from
 these Expressions, which ascribe Wis-
 dom, Dominion, Immortality, and Good-
 ness to God alone, conclude that our
 blessed Saviour is neither Wise, nor
 Powerful, nor Immortal, nor so much as
 Good? If such an Inference from these
 Texts would be blasphemous, Why
 should it not be equal Blasphemy from
 this Expression, *the Father is the only
 true God*, to say, that the Son is not
 so?

And yet such was the Opinion of
 Arius, who, in the Nicene Council, ob-
 jected this Text against the Divinity
 of Christ, saying thus; Ὁρᾷς ὅτι μόνον
 ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν ἔφη τὸν Πατέρα, ὡς αὐτὸ
 μὴ ὄντος ἀληθινῷ Θεῷ; i. e. you see that
 Christ here calls his Father, the only true
 God; intimating thereby, that he him-
 self is not so. To this Objection Atha-
 n. in nasius quickly made this just reply,
 disp. adv. Arium. p. 126, 127. Τὸ τοῦ συνδεδεμένου ἔστι τῷ περιεργημένῳ ῥη-
 μάτων, καὶ τῷ ἐπαχθέντων ἢ διαίρεσιν
 ἐμποίων Ἀρεσέως δὲ ὡς αὐτοῖς δύφρον-
 σιν ὡμολόγηται σύνδεσμος. τὸ ὅτι τῆς κυρια-
 κῆς φωνῆς; i. e. These two Clauses of
 our

our Lord's Speech, *That they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*, are knit together by the Copulative; And, being so conjoynd, the Sense of them must be this, *ἵνα γινώσκωσι τὸν υἱὸν σου ἀληθινὸν Θεόν, ὡς παρὰ καὶ σε τὸν Πατέρα*; that they may know thy Son to be the true God, even as they know thee the Father to be so. Thus *Athanasius*.

In the same manner doth great *St. Basil*. *M. Basil* expound the same Text; *Ὁ ἀληθινὸς πρὸς τὸς ψευδῶς ἀποδοσελλόμενος λέγεται*. *Οὐτε μόνον ἀληθινὸν τὸν Πατέρα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸς λεησμένους μὴ ψευδῶς, ἐκ ὧντος δὲ ἀδιακρίτως ἐν εἰς Πατέρα καὶ εἰς υἱὸν παῦται λέγεται*; i. e. Our Lord calls his Father, *the only true God*; not as if his Person alone were so, but in opposition to those *Idols*, who were then thought to be Gods, but really were not such. But the Title of the *True God*, doth in this Text equally belong both to the *Father* and the *Son*. So thought Great *St. Basil*.

To these Authorities we may add that of *Ignatius*, who, mentioning our Lord and this Expression of his, faith of him thus; *Τοῖς ἑξακείλασιν εἰς πλὴν δέξαν τὸν ἕνα καὶ μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν καὶ ἡγήγαιε τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Πατέρα*; i. e. Our Lord

adv. Eumom. l. 4. p. 106, 107.

Ignat. in Epist. ad Magnes. p. 151.

Grot. in
locum E-
rasm. in

Lord declared his *Father* to be, the *only true God*, to such, and for their sakes, who had or might fall into *Polytheism*. But did our Lord here deny his own Divinity? No such matter, for even *Erasmus* and *Grotius*, who favour the *Socinians* in what Texts soever they can, do expound this Text against them: For, saith *Grotius*, the *Father* is here called, the *only true God*; *Exclusis omnibus iis, quos falsa Gentium persuasio introduxerat*: To exclude all those, whom the false persuasion of the Gentiles had introduced for Gods. But did not our Lord here exclude himself too? No, saith *Erasmus*, *Cum solum dixit, non excludit filium; sed separat verum Deum à diis Gentium*. When our Lord stiles his Father, the *only true God*, he doth not shut out himself the Son, but distinguisheth the true God from the *Idols* of the Heathens.

1 Job. 5.
20.

And indeed, that these fore-named Authors were not at all mistaken in their Interpretation of this Text, is evident from that assertion of St. *John*, who positively saith of Christ, *This is the True God, and Life Eternal*. Certainly, St. *John*, being an inspired Apostle did not, could not leave the World a false Character of his Master, and

and by representing him as the true God, if he were not so, seduce the *Catholick Church* throughout all succeeding Ages into an Idolatrous Worship, against which he himself hath left us this friendly Caution, and that in the very next words, *Little Children keep your selves from Idols.*

Now then, if we dare rely upon the Judgment of these and many more learned Interpreters, Men famous in their Generations; nay, if we dare trust the Authority of *St. John* himself, who was our Lord's most beloved Disciple; we must acknowledge, that when our Saviour called his Father, the *only true God*, he meant it only in opposition to the many *false* Gods of the Pagan World, but as for *his own* Divinity, his whole Expression took together doth rather *confirm* than *disprove* it.

And if from this Text our Author can find no Countenance for that ill Opinion of his, with which he seems to be enamoured, if he shall turn his Bible over and over, I am confident, that if he will not *strain* and force the Scriptures, but permit every Text plainly to speak its own Sense, and according to the Analogy of our Christian Faith, he will not find, after all his Scrutiny,
so

so much as any one Text, from which he can fairly infer this Conclusion, which he owns as a Truth, but can never prove it such; namely, that the True God, who was the God of *Israel*, and is the Father of Christ, is but *one* in Person.

S E C T. IV.

AND now it may be an Act of Charity to convince this Author of his Error, and to shew him, that the God of *Israel*, who is now called, the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, was not, is not, as this Man asserts, only *one* in Person. For although the *Father* of our Lord, in respect of his *eternal* Generation, which this Man denieth, were *one* Person only; yet besides this one Person, there are *two* more, who were the God of *Israel*; and one of these two may be called in an especial manner, and a very good Sense the *Father* of Christ in regard of his Humane Nature, of which more hereafter in a more proper place.

That the God of *Israel* was more than *one* in Person, hath been the general

neral Belief of the Catholick Church, and still is the common Faith of our best Divines; nor is this rashly believed, nor took up only as a *Tradition* derived from our Progenitours; but they, who were and are of this Opinion, had and have such strong Reasons for it, as all the Enemies of this Truth can never overthrow.

Now, to prove that the God of *Israel* was indeed *more than one* in Person, I shall use two sorts of Arguments; 1. Such Arguments as seem to be very *fair*, plausible, and to carry great Probability in them; as being grounded upon the *Authority* of judicious Men, and their common Interpretations of such and such Texts. 2. Such Arguments as are *Apodictical*, Demonstrative, and undeniable; as being grounded upon the express, plain, and infallible *Word* of God; such Texts, as can admit but of one Sense only.

The probable Arguments which I shall use to prove that the God of *Israel* was *more than one* in Person, shall be these Two;

I. That God, who often appeared to *Abraham*, *Jacob*, *Moses*, and other good Men of the Jewish Nation, was the God of *Israel*. But that God, who thus

this appeared, was more than One in Person.

2. That God, who appeared in the Flaming Bush, and *delivered* the Law to *Moses*, was the God of *Israel*. But that God, who thus appeared, and delivered the Law, was *more* than *one* in Person.

S E C T. V.

MY first Argument, which doth probably prove that the God of *Israel* was more than *one* in Person, is this; That God who often appeared to *Abraham*, *Jacob*, *Moses*, and other Men of the Jewish Nation, was the God of *Israel*. But that God, who thus appeared, was more than *one* in Person.

Gen. 18.1: The Text saith, *The Lord appeared unto Abraham*; "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Θεός, God appeared, so the *seventy*; but how, not as he is in himself, but under some other shape; the *Arabick* Version reads it, *Angelus Dei*, the *Angel* of God appeared; but the next Verse tells us, *Three men stood by him, juxta, near him*; so the *Chaldee* Paraphrase, *coram, before*

fore him; so the *Arabick*, super, over or above him; so the *Samaritan* Version.

But though at first sight *Abraham* might think these three Persons to be no more than Men, yet he quickly seemed to be of another mind; for, the Text saith, *He bowed himself down to the ground*, *ωγεσύννους*; saith the seventy, *adoravit*, he adored; so most *Latin* Translations, *prostravit se*, he laid himself prostrate before them; so the *Samaritan* Version. Now, all these words seem to import that kind of Worship, which is most proper and peculiar to God alone.

And indeed, if the most judicious Men are not much mistaken, such a *Divine* Worship, as these words imply, was very fit for those three Persons, whom *Abraham* had the Honour to Entertain; for they are supposed, and not without reason, to be the three Persons in the *Godhead*, who were then pleased to disguise themselves, and appear in the shape of Men. For to one of them, or to all three as one, did *Abraham* thus address himself, *my Lord*, and the same Lord is afterwards once and again called *Jehovah*, which is, saith *Ravanellus*, *Nomen solius Dei proprium*, a Name never

ver communicated to any *Angel*, but appropriate to *God* alone. And it is observable that one of these *three* Persons in all this Story is never called an *Angel*, though he be stiled a *Man*.

And that by this *Man* God the *Father* might be meant seems the more probable, because we find him represented under the notion of a *Man* by our blessed Saviour himself, and that more than once; when our Lord said, *A certain man* planted a vineyard, and again, *A certain man* made a great supper, 'tis sure, that by this *Certain Man*, our Lord, in both these Texts, meant God his *Father*. And that one of those *three Men*, who appeared to *Abraham*, might represent God the *Father* is an Opinion far from being New. For, when *Macdonius* put this question to *Athanasius*, 'Ο Πατήρ μετ' αὐτῶν ὤφειλε; Did the *Father* appear with the other two? *Athanasius* answered, Καὶ νῦν; yes, verily he did so. Of the same mind was *Origen*, who, as *Huetius* reports and interprets him, wrote thus, *Gratia Dei alio se aspiciendum praebebat viro iusto; hoc autem solum super Deo Patre non intelligas; sed etiam super Domino Salvatore, & super spiritu sancto; God* was graciously pleased of his own free will to

Athanas.
Dial. 3.
de Trin.
p. 222.

Huet. in
Origen. l.
2. p. 50.

to exhibit himself in a visible manner to the Just Man *Abraham*; but this must not be understood only of God the *Father*, but also of our *Lord* and *Saviour*, and his *Holy Spirit* too.

But if this appearance of God the *Father* in the shape of a *Man* shall be denied or doubted, yet that our blessed *Saviour* Tert. adv. Marcion. l. 2. c. 27. did in those early days often appear in the form of an *Angel*, hath been, so far as I can find, the general Opinion of the antient *Fathers*. *Tertullian* with much confidence delivers this for a Truth, *Profitemur Christum semper egisse in nomine Patris, ipsum ab initio conversatum, ipsum congressum cum Patriarchis & Prophetis filium Creatoris, &c.* Tert. adv. Prax. c. 16. so he saith elsewhere, *A primordio omnem ordinem divina dispositionis per filium decurrisse, &c.* Tert. adv. Marc. l. 3. c. 10. and yet again, *Christus ipse cum Angelis apud Abraham in veritate quidem carnis apparuit; sed non natus; quia nondum Moritura; sed & discantis jam inter homines conversari;* the sum of all which amounts to this, namely, that our *Lord* from the very *Infancy* of the *World* did often appear in it to good *Men*, sometimes in the form of an *Angel*, and sometimes in the shape of a *Man*; and under such disguises, did act in his *Father's Name*, and manage

all the dispensations of his Providence. So thought *Tertullian*.

The same Appearance of God to *Abraham* do the Greek Fathers interpret the same way too; thus great *St. Basil*,
Basil. M. adv. Eunom. l. 2. p. 56, 57. Τίς ὁ αὐτός Ἀγγελος καὶ Θεός; ἐκὶ περι-
 ῖ μαμαδία μὴ οὐκ ἡλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ
 μεγάλῃς βουλῇ; Ἀγγελος; ποῦ δὲ ἄλλου οὐκ
 ἔνδοξ' Ἄγγελος καὶ Θεός αὐτὸς προσκείμενται,
 μονογενὴς ὅτι δαδαίμην; *i. e.* Who is he,
 which is called both *God* and *Angel* too?
 Is it not he, of whom we have learned,
 that his Name is called, the *Angel of the*
great Council? 'Tis manifest to every
 Man that wheresoever the same Person
 is stiled both *God* and *Angel*, 'tis meant
 of the only begotten *Son* of *God*. So
St. Basil.

Much to the same purpose writes
Euseb. Hist. l. 1. c. 2. p. 6. *Eusebius* about this Vision of three Men
 to *Abraham*, ὁφθαλμοὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος, τῷ Ἀβραάμ
 ὁ δὲ ὑποπτεῖται αὐτὸς ἄνθρωπον ὁφθαλ-
 μοῖς ὅσον προσκυνεῖ μὴ ὡς Θεόν, ἰκάνω
 δι' ὡς κύριον. Οὐ μολογῶ πὶ μὴ ἀγνοῶ
 ὅτις εἶη, ῥήματι αὐτοῖς λέγων, κύριε, ὁ
 κρείων πάντων τῶν γῆν, Θεός ἐστι κύριος ὁ
 κρείων πάντων τῶν γῆν, ὃν ἀνθρώπου ὁρῶμε-
 νος χιμῶν, τίς αὖ ἔτιος εἶη, ἢ μόνος
 κύριος; *i. e.* The Lord God is said to
 have been seen by *Abraham* as a com-
 mon

mon Man; but he, beholding with his Eyes no more than a Man, immediately fell down and worshipped him as a God, and petitioned him as a Lord; acknowledging that he knew who he was, by saying, Lord, who judgest all the Earth, and this God and Lord, who judgeth all the Earth, being seen in the shape of a Man, who else can he be, but the Word, i. e. Christ alone? So Eusebius.

To these may be added the Testimony of Athanasius about the same matter, who puts this question, Τίτι μετ-
ακίνησεν ὅτι τὸν γῆν; ἢ ἀνδράσιν; Who
was he, whom Abraham fell down
and worshipped? Did he worship mere
Men? Macedonius answered, Ὁ Θεὸς ἦν
εἰς, μετὰ ὃν ἔδιδάξαται· οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι δύο,
Ἀγγελοι; i. e. One of the Three, with
whom Abraham discoursed, was God;
and the other two were Angels; to
which Athanasius replied, Ὁκ παρεξέ-
ταται εἰς τῶν δύο Ἀγγέλων ὁ υἱὸς ἦν, αὐτὴ
ἡ γραφὴ ἐδίδαξε; The Scripture it self
doth most clearly teach that one of
these two Angels was the Son of God.
Nay, Macedonius himself granted thus
much, Ἐγὼ λέγω, ὅκ ὁ υἱὸς ἦν ὁ ὁφθῆς
τῷ Ἀβραάμ· Even I say, that he, who
was seen by Abraham, was the Son of
God.

Athanasius
dial. 3. de
Trin. p.
217, 218;
219, 222.

Nor was *Abraham* the only Person to whom our Lord was pleased in those early days to appear and shew himself, though under a disguise, for he afterwards appeared to *Jacob*; and that, saith *Gregory Nazianzene*, *alibi in Angelo, alibi in homine*, at one time, and in one place, in the form of an *Angel*; at another time, and in another place, in the shape of a *Man*. Accordingly it was the saying of *Origen*, as *Huetius* cites him, *non unus Domini mei Jesu Christi adventus, quo descendit ad terras*, my Lord Jesus Christ descended to the Earth more than once, *ad Esaiam venit, ad Moysen venit, & ad unumquemque Prophetarum*; He came down to *Esaias*, to *Moses*, and to every one of the *Prophets*.

Gregor.
Naz. Or.
49 p. 734,
735.

Huet. O-
rigen. l. 2.
quest. 3.

Origen. in
Joannem,
p. 32.

Origen. in
Mat. tom.
12. p. 302.

The same *Origen*, in his Commentary upon St. *John's* Gospel, writes thus, Περὶ τῶν Ἀγγέλων αὐτὸν γερονέναι πειθαίμεθα πρὸς τὰς εἰς Ἀγγέλων ἐπιφανείας ἐ λόγους· ἐν ἑσὶ τόποις τῆς γραφῆς Ἀγγέλων λεγόντων· ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Θεός, &c. i. e. That our blessed Saviour did sometimes become as an *Angel*, we may be induced to believe, if we consider the Appearances and Speeches of *Angels*, who, in some Texts, have said, *I am the God of Abraham*, &c. And to the same purpose he elsewhere speaks thus, Νοήσατε οἱ Μαθηταί

μαθηταὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καλεσάμεναι Μω-
σαι, & αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν εἰρηκότα. Οὐ γάρ
ὁφθαλμοὶ ἀνθρώπου τὸ θεωῦσιν με, & ζῶσι-
ται. The Disciples of Christ understood
that the Son of God was he, who, as an
Oracle gave Moses, who desired to see
his Face, this Admonition, *no man shall
see my face, and live.*

To the same purpose is that Text
interpreted by several Judicious Men,
where we are told, *The Angel of the* Exod. 3. 2.
Lord appeared to Moses in a flame of August. de
fire out of the midst of a bush; The Trin. l. 2,
Question is, who this Angel was; St. c. 12.
Austin, observing that he who now ap-
peared to Moses, is called first an Angel,
and then God, makes this demand, Nun-
quid Angelus est Deus Abraam, &c.? Is
an Angel the God of Abraham? if not,
Who was this, that so stiled himself?
he answers, *Potest recte intelligi & ipse*
Salvator; even our Saviour himself may
here very well be meant.

Of the same Judgment was Theodoret, Theodor.
who delivers his Opinion thus, *Hujus* à Pererio
loci lectio declarat quis sit, qui visus est; in Exod.
apparuit Angelus Domini, & dixit, Ego 3. 2.
sum Deus Abraam, &c. & iterum, Ego
sum, qui sum, universus iste locus Deum
esse, qui apparuit, probat; sed quæ Persona
Deitatis? Non Pater, non Spiritus Sanctus,

qui nunquam Angeli appellantur; restat itaque fuisse Dei Filium, qui magni Concilii est Angelus: i. e. The reading of this place (Exod. 3.) declares who it was, that was seen by Moses; the Text saith, *The Angel of the Lord appeared to Moses, and said, I am the God of Abraham, &c. and again, I am that I am.* This whole context proves him, that appeared to be God, but which Person might it be? Not the Father, not the Holy Spirit, who are never called Angels; wherefore it remains that he was the Son of God, who is the Angel of the great Counsel. So he.

St. Stephen, referring to the same appearance, mentions the same Angel, of whom Occumenius writes thus, Τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἀγγελον οὖν καλεῖ, καὶ δὲ περ ἐκ Ἀγγελῶν ἄλλα χεῖ αὐτοῖς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ μεγάλαις βολῇς Ἀγγελος. Καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον δεῖχουσιν αὐτὸν, λέγοντες ἰδοὺ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Πατὲρ σου; i. e. The Scripture doth here call, the Son of God, an Angel, as elsewhere it styles him, a Man, and by and by it discovers him by his saying, *I am the God of thy Fathers.* St. Chrysostom saith the same thing, and adds thus much to it, Ὁ τόπος αἱγιῶ. τῇ ἐμφανείᾳ καὶ ἐργείᾳ τῇ χειρὶ; the place where Moses stood, is called, *Holy Ground,*

Occumen.
in Act. 7.

Chrysost.
in Act. 7.
33.

Ground, because Consecrated by the presence, appearance and energy of Christ.

To these Authorities of the *Ancient Fathers*, I might add the Testimonies of later and modern *Divines*; Mr. Ayns-
worth saith of the Angel, which appeared in the flaming Bush; *This was Christ*, who called himself, *the God of Abraham*, and for that reason, *Moses*, blessing *Joseph*, mentioned, *the good will of him, that dwelt in the bush*: And the same learned Author cites *Rabbi Menachem* for this assertion; *This Angel is that Angel the Redeemer, who said to Jacob, I am the God of Bethel*; and for that reason, say our *English Annotations*, *This was no created Angel*, but as *St. Cyprian* peremptorily asserts, *Idem Angelus & Deus Christus*, the same Christ was this God, and this Angel too: God in reality, an Angel in appearance. *Tertullian* saith as much, *Qui ad Moysen loquebatur, erat Dei Filius, qui & semper videbatur*; he that spake to *Moses* out of the Bush, was the *Son of God*; and he was the Person that still appeared.

Now, to sum up this Argument drawn from several Texts, as they are interpreted by many learned Men, so far as we may rely upon the Judgment of such Expositours, and that in a

*Ayns. in
Exod. 3.*

*Cyprianus
adv. Ju-
deos. l. 2.
p. 250.*

*Tertull.
adv. Ju-
deos. l. 2.
c. 194.*

matter, which no man can disprove; so far we may conclude, that the God, who was pleased to shew himself to *Abraham, Jacob, Moses*, and some other good Men, sometimes as a *Man*, but more frequently as an *Angel*, was indeed our blessed *Saviour*; and if so, 'tis evident that the God of *Israel*, being the same with the God of *Abraham*, was whatever the *Socinian* Author foolishly thinks to the contrary, more than *one* in Person.

S E C T. VI.

MY second Argument, which carrieth a fair Probability in it, if the Judgment of Pious and Learned Men be any whit valuable, to prove that the God of *Israel* was more than *one* in Person shall be this;

That God, who delivered the *Law* upon Mount *Sinai*, was the God of *Israel*. But that God, who there delivered that *Law*, was more than *one* in Person.

That God the *Father* is the *only* Person in the Deity is the Doctrine of our *Socinians*; and consequently they stand oblo-

obliged by their own Principles either to grant that the Law was given and delivered by God the Father, or else to deny its Divine Original, which, I think they do not do.

The Evangelist indeed tells us, *The Law was given by Moses*, but how that was, *Origen* tells us, who thus distinguisheth, *Νενοτήκετο μὲν μὴ τῶν νόμων διὰ Μωσέως δίδωσθαι, ἔκ τῶν Μωσέως*; i. e. We understand that the Law was given by *Moses*, but not from him. 'Tis sure that *Origen* means the same thing, which *Erasmus* thus expresseth, *Moses Legis Author non fuit*, *Moses* was not the Author of that Law: No, *Castalio* tells us, *Quod Lex data est, Divini fuit beneficii*, The giving of the Law was from the kindness of God. As for *Moses*, 'tis said, *He received the lively Oracles*, *Διακρινόμενος. Ἐ λαβὼν παρ' ἱησοῦ*, saith *St. Chrysostom*, he received the Law from another; and so proved not the Legislator to establish and make the Law; but a Minister, an Herald, a Scribe, to receive, proclaim and write it. So that *Ebion*, that pestilent Heretick, had no reason to think *Moses*, who is said to have given the Law, to be upon that score, a greater Man than *Christ*.

The Job. i. 17.
Origen. in Joann.

Erasm. in Joann. c. i. 17.
Castal. in Joann. i. 16.

Chrysost. in Joann. i. 17.

But

But although the first Promulgation and delivery of this Law upon Mount Sinai cannot possibly be ascribed unto Moses; yet it seems very clearly to be attributed unto Angels. Thus St. Paul,

Heb. 2. 2. *For if the word spoken by Angels was sted-*

Theophyl. *fast, &c. What Word was that? Theo-*
in locum. *phylact answers, Ἡ τοῖς ὀδεῖσιν, ἢ πάν-*

τα πᾶσι προστάγματα τα ἐν τῇ πυλαίᾳ δια-
τῶν Ἀγγέλων οἰκονομηθέντα; the Apo-
stle means either the Decalogue, or ge-
nerally all those Commands, which were
dispensed by the Ministry of Angels
under the Old Testament. Thus St.

Chrys. in *Chrysostom, Δεκάλογος, Προστάγματα, the*
locum. *Decalogue, the Commandment, Lex Mo-*

Grotius in *sis, the Law of Moses; so Grotius. And*
locum. *of this Law doth the same Apostle else-*
where thus affirm, Διαταγὰς δὲ Ἀγγέ-
λων, it was ordained by Angels; How
so?— Ministerio Angelorum, by the Mi-
nistry of Angels; so Clusius. 'Tis the
Observation of Grotius, that the Law
was pronounced by some one of the
Angels, others attending round about
him.

And that the Law was indeed deli-
vered by some one single Angel, seems evi-
dent from that expression of St. Stephen,

Act. 7. 38. *This is that Moses, who was in the Church*
in the Wilderness, with the Angel that
spake

spake to him in the Mount Sinai, *μετ' Ἀγγέλων*, with the Angel, the Expression imports, that it was some one particular Angel, who pronounced the Law. But the question is, *Who* this Angel was? *Grotius* saith, it was, *unus ex principibus Angelis*, one of the Chiefest Angels; it was such an Angel, as was counted worthy to represent the Person, and bear the Name of God. So *Moses* tells us, *God spake all these Words*; and *Exod. 20.* as *Moses* gives him this glorious Title, ^{1.} so doth this Angel himself assume it, *I am the Lord thy God*; and that he was so indeed, the People believed, who said, *The Lord our God hath shewed us his Glory, and we have heard his Voice*; we have seen this day, that God doth talk with man, &c. From such Expressions do learned Men gather, that the Person, who delivered the Law, was God himself, either appearing under the Form, or at least speaking by the Tongue of an Angel.

Grotius in Heb. 2. 2.

Exod. 20.

Deut. 5. 24.

And indeed that it was no created Angel, but some Person of the blessed Trinity, that delivered the Law, was the Opinion not only of *Philo* the Jew, but of *St. Cyprian*, *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, and some other Fathers of the Christian Church, who affirmed with
one

one Consent, *revera fuisse Deum*. that it was God indeed ; and in particular, the *second* Person in the Trinity, whose various appearances under the Old Testament were nothing else, but as St. Austin calls them, *Symbola & Praludia Incarnationis*, the Symbols, Tokens and Essays of his Incarnation.

Greg. Nazianz. Or.
49.

This is that, which Gregory Nazianzen confidently affirms, *Filium Dei in monte Sina cum Mose locutum esse scimus*, that the Son of God upon Mount Sinai did discourse with Moses, is a thing that we know. And to this purpose

Chrysost. in
Act. 7.30.

doth St Chrysostom expound that passage of St. Stephen, *He was in the Wilderness with the Angel*; What Angel means he? St. Chrysostom answers, *Τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἀγγέλων καλεῖ*; 'tis the Son of God, whom he calls an Angel. And again, a little after, *Ἐνταῦθα δεικνύσιν ὅτι ὁ ὀφείδεις αὐτῷ Ἀγγέλος ἦν ὁ μεγάλης βουλῆς Ἀγγέλος*, the Expression sheweth, that the Angel who appeared to Moses, was the Angel of the great Council ; and that is, saith Dionysius the Areopagite, *Ἀυτὸς Ἰησοῦς*, Jesus himself.

Dionysius
Areopag.
Cael. Hier.
l. 4.

Indeed, the same Dionysius in the same Chapter saith, *Διδάσκει τὰ τοῦ Θεολογία τὴν ἱεράν τοῦ νόμου δεσποσύναν δι' Ἀγγέλων εἰς ἡμᾶς παρελθεῖν*, the Scriptures

Scriptures teach us, that the Divine Law was handed to us by *Angels*. So *Josephus* too, Τα χάρισμα τῶν ἀγγέλων *Joseph. l.* ἐπὶ τὰ ὁσιώτατα ἐν τοῖς νόμοις δι' Ἀγγέλων, our most Excellent Doctrines and most Holy Precepts were delivered to us by *Angels*.

Well, suppose it were certain that *Angels*, properly so called, created *Angels*, had to do with the delivery of the Law; yet this doth no way hinder but that *Christ* might be, and 'tis judged that he was the *Legislator* notwithstanding. For whosoever this *Angel* was, that which he delivered, was certainly the dictate of God. 'Tis so acknowledged by *Josephus*, Ταύτην Μωϋσῆς τὴν διατάξιν τῶν νόμων ἐδέξατο παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, *Joseph. Antiq. Judaic. l. 3. c. 10.* *Moses* learnt these Constitutions and Laws from God.

And that the *second Person* in the *Trinity* was he, who dictated this Law to *Moses*, was the Opinion of *Oecumenius*, *Secum. in Gal. 3. 19.* who writes thus, Ὁ Θεός ἐστιν ὁ ἐπὶ τὸν νόμον ἐπὶ τὸ Ἐυαγγέλιον δέξαι; it is God who gave both the Law and the Gospel; but which *Person* might it be? he answers, Ὁ μεσιτεύων ἐπὶ ἀποσταλάξαι πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα τὴν ἐκείνου ὁ αὐτὸς ὅς ἐστι Χριστός; 'twas he, who intercedes for as our *Mediator* and *Reconciler* to his Father, even the

August.
contra A-
dimant.
c. 9.

the same, who is Christ, though he were then under the shape of an Angel, or at least spake in and by one. For as St. Austin observes, *Quemadmodum Verbum Dei, quod est Christus, loquitur in Propheta, sic & in Angelo loquitur*; as the Word of God, which is Christ, spake in a Prophet, so did he speak in an Angel too.

Cæsar. Rhod.
Antiq. l.
18. c. 19.

I remember Cælius Rhodiginus tells us that the Lawgivers of several Nations were very ambitious to make their Subjects believe, that all the Laws which they established, were derived from some Deity or other. Thus Trismegistus Fathered his Laws upon Mercury; Draco and Solon, theirs upon Minerva; Zamolxis, his upon Vesta; Plato, his upon Jupiter and Apollo; Numa, his upon Egeria, &c. Now, that Divine honour, which they sought for their Laws, ours undoubtedly hath, as being infallibly the Law of God, or, which is all one, the Law of Christ, that glorious Lawgiver, with whom those of this World, whom Seneca

Seneca E-
pist. 9.

mentions for the wisest, Solon, Lycurgus, Zaleucus, Charondas, &c. are not once to be named.

Now, to sum up this Argument, since the Law of Moses was certainly given by a God, and since he who gave the Law

Law

Law in the Opinion of many Judicious Men, is supposed to be the Eternal Son of God ; so far as we may rely upon the Authority of such Pious and Learned Interpreters, we may conclude upon this ground also, that the God of *Israel*, who delivered his Laws to *Moses*, and by him to the Jewish Nation, was more than *One* in Person.

And indeed that the *second* Person in the *Trinity* should deliver the Law, seems the more probable, because he was the Person already designed in after-times to explain and fulfil the Law, and to call Men to an account for it, to reward Obedience to it, and to punish the Transgressions of it.

But because these two Arguments being only probable and grounded upon the Opinion of Men, who are subject to mistakes, will not satisfy our *Sociinian* Author, that the God of *Israel* was more than *One* in Person ; I shall to convince him of his Error, and to prove the same Truth with the greatest certainty, add 2 Arguments more, which I take to be clear Demonstrations, as being grounded upon the express, plain and infallible Word of God.

SECT. VII.

TO prove against this *Socinian* Author, that the God of *Israel* was more than *one* in Person, my first Argument, which I take to be convincing and unanswerable by any Man who believes the Scripture, shall be this ;

That God, who created the World was the God of *Israel*. But that God who created the World, was more than *one* in Person.

To confirm the *major* Proposition I need not name any *Text*, nor cite any *Authority*, because I suppose that our *Socinians* will readily grant its Truth ; and if they will, the Truth of the *minor* Proposition will be very easily proved. That God the *Father* is the *only* Person in the Deity, is the Doctrine of our *Socinians*, and therefore that the *Father* created the World they cannot deny, unless they be of the same mind with *Aristotle*, who said, "Εὐλογον ἡπολαβέν
ωκεῖ ἕαρε, ὅτε ἀγέννητος ἔσ' ἀφθάρτων ; it is reasonable to think that Heaven is a Substance ingenerable and incorruptible,
nor

*Arist. l. i.
de Caelo.*

nor dare I charge these Men with the Opinion of the *Epicureans*, who thought that Heaven and Earth were produced, *ex fortuita Atomorum cohaesione*, by a fortuitous Concourse and Union of Atomes; nor with that of *Strato Lampiscenus*, who imagined, that Heaven and Earth were from Eternity; *suapte natura, vi ac potestate*, of themselves, their own nature, strength and power. These Opinions being so very absurd and ridiculous, I shall take it for granted, that the Creation of the World by God the Father, is one Article of our *Socinians* Creed.

And if it be so indeed, it should be a second Article of their Creed, that there are more Persons than *one* in the Godhead, if we can find one Person more, besides the *Father*, by whom the World was created. And such a Person hath *St. John* helped us to; for thus he writes, *In the beginning Joh. 1. 1. 2. was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God*; and his Deity he proves by this undeniable Argument. *By him all things were made, &c.* The Words are so very plain, so incapable of any *Figurative* or any other tolerable Sense, that 'tis very strange that any Man of common Reason should attempt

tempt to divert them from their literal Meaning, and refer them to any thing else but the *first* Creation.

And the rather, if to this Testimony of St. *John*, we add that of St. *Paul*, Col. 1. 16. who saith of Christ, *By him were all things created, which are in Heaven, and which are in Earth, things visible and invisible, &c.* an Expression which comprehends the Universe, and in most plain words, which cannot be eluded by any Pretence of *Metaphors* or *Metonymies*, asserts our blessed Saviour to be the Creatour of Heaven and Earth, and all things in both.

I know that our *Socinians* do what they can to defeat the Force of that Argument, which we draw from these Texts, to prove the Divinity of our blessed Saviour; and to that end they pretend that the Creation here ascribed to Christ, is not the *old* Creation described by *Moses*; but that *new* Creation, as they call it; that Renovation or Reformation of the World, which was introduced by Christ during his abode here below, and afterwards carried on by his Apostles according to his Command. But this Cavil is so unreasonable, so inconsistent with the Contents of these Texts, so contrary to the general

general Judgment of the best Interpreters; that no Man could offer to pretend it, were not his Reason blinded with Prejudice; were he not wedded, or rather enslaved to that Party of Men who have entertained that dangerous Opinion, which these Texts being understood in their genuine, natural and necessary Sense, do most clearly confute and overthrow.

St. John saith of Christ, *By him were all things made, and without him was nothing made*; if this be true, as doubtless it is, then the Beasts of the Earth, the Fishes of the Sea, the Fowls of Heaven, Plants, Vegetables, Minerals, &c. were the Creatures of Christ; But could any of these be concerned in that new Creation, which is pretended? If not, the old Creation must here be meant as the Effect and Workmanship of Christ.

But if our Socinians shall object and say, that St. John, by *All things* created by Christ, meant not *All Creatures*, but all those *Institutions*, all matters whatsoever, which any way related to the whole Oeconomy of the Gospel; let them consider what St. Paul saith, *By him all things were created; which are in Heaven, and which are in Earth, things visible*

visible and invisible; and then he instances particularly in the several Degrees and Orders, of Angels, *Thrones Dominations, Principalities and Powers*; from which words 'tis evident, that Angels are the Creatures of Christ, but when did he make them?

Moses, indeed, describing the Creation, makes no express mention of Angels, nor of the precise time, wherein they were created; for that reason St.

August. de Incarnat. Verbi, l. 1. c. 6. *Austin* saith, *Quando creati sint Angeli, non satis in manifesto distinguitur*; when Angels were created, is no where clearly delivered. But although the punctual time of this Creation cannot be certainly determined, yet several Con-

August. de Civ. Dei, l. 11. c. 32. jectures are made about it. St. *Austin* mentions some who thought the An-

Plato in Timæo. gels were created, *ante cælum & terram*, before Heaven and Earth. So thought *Plato*, who imagined that the Angels whom he called, *Deos Juniores*, Junior Gods, were of a far longer standing than Heaven and Earth. But the Opin-

Pineda in Job. c. 38. v. 7. ion of *Pineda* is much more probable, *simul cum Mundo corporeo creatos esse Angelos*, the Angels were created together with the corporeal World. And for this

Epiphan. tom 2. l. 2. h. 65. saying he cited *Epiphanius*, *unà cum cælo & terra creati quoque sunt Angeli*, Angels were

also were created *together* with Heaven and Earth. And indeed it is most probable, and the general Opinion of the Interpreters, that Angels were made up on the very *first* day of the Creation; and Perhaps, for that reason might they be stiled, *The Stars of the morning*, - as *Job 38. 7.* being such Glorious and such Early Creatures.

Now then, since the *Angels*, mentioned by *St. Paul*, as the Creatures of Christ, were certainly made in the very Infancy of the World: What Concern could they have after so many Ages, in that *new* Creation, which our *Socinians* pretend, allowing our Lord no hand in the *old* one? 'Tis sure, that the *good Angels* did need no Renovation; and 'tis as sure, that for the *evil Angels* there was none intended. So that we may safely conclude, that when *St. Paul* tells us, that Angels were created by Christ, he means the first or *old* Creation, because the *new* one concerned them not. And the truth is, if they extend this *new* Creation to Angels, 'tis but a *new Invention* of their own, 'tis but an, *Ens rationis*, a Creature of their own Creating.

But to sum up this Argument, 'tis evident from several plain Texts, that Angels, as well as all other inferiour Be-

ings, were created by Christ; and 'tis clear that this whole Work of Creation was perfectly finished within six days; and that many Ages before our Lord's Incarnation, the time to which the new Creation must be referred; and in this new Creation, no *Angel*, no *Creature*, save only *Man*, was any way concerned; it must follow by an undeniable consequence, that those Texts which ascribe to our blessed Saviour, the Creation of all things, must be understood of the *first* Creation, wherein our Lord had an equal hand with his Father. And since Creation is a work of that Infinite Power, whereof no Creature is capable, it doth necessarily prove, that Christ, who had, and exercised such an Omnipotent Power, was not a *mere Man*, but *God* most *Hights*; and since the Creatour of the World was the God of *Israel*, our Lord being that Creatour, and a Person distinct from his Father, we may infallibly conclude that the God of *Israel* was more than *one* in Person, tho' this *Sacanian* Scribler be of another mind. But I shall yet urge one Argument more.

S E C T. VIII.

MY last Argument, which I think sufficient to convince this Socinian Author, that the God of *Israel* was and is more than *one* in Person, shall be this;

That God, who spake to and by the Prophets of the Jewish Church, was the God of *Israel*. But that God, who spake to and by those Prophets, was more than *one* in Person.

The major Proposition is so evident, that it needs no great Proof; 'tis very usual with the Prophets to tell us, *Thus* Esa. 43. *saith the Lord*, What Lord? *the Lord* 14. *the Redeemer, the Holy one of Israel.* St. Paul tells us, God at sundry times, and Heb. 1. 1. *in divers manners, spake in time past to the Father by the Prophets.* And again, *All Scripture is given by Inspiration of* 2 Tim. 3. *God.* That by this Lord and this God, 16. to whom the Scriptures are here ascribed, we are to understand God the Father, must needs be the belief of the Socinians, since they acknowledge no other Person in the Deity, and yet own the Divine Authority of our Bibles, except some Texts, which do clearly make against them.

That the Scriptures are the undoubted Oracles of God, and that God the *Father* spake to and by the Prophets, being granted by our *Socinians*; we shall enquire whether he who spake to and by the Prophets, were God the *Father only*, or some *other* Person too. This doubt must be determined by the Testimony of those Divine Oracles, which the Prophets, Evangelists and Apostles, received from God, and we from Them.

Now, St. *Peter* saith of the Prophets,
 1 Pet. 1. *The Spirit of Christ was in them*, and
 11. what that *Spirit* did, he elsewhere tells
 2 Pet. 1. us, *Holy men spake, as they were moved*
 21. *by the Holy Ghost*; so spake the Prophet
David, as the same Apostle testifieth,
 Act. 1. 16. *The Holy Ghost by the mouth of David*
spake concerning Judas; and so he did
 Act. 28. by the Prophet *Esaías*, *Well spake the*
 25. *Holy Ghost by the Prophet Esaías*; and so
 Ezek. 11. by the Prophet *Ezekiel*, *The Spirit of the*
 5. *Lord fell upon me, and said unto me, speak,*
thus saith the Lord. There was upon
 the Prophets, saith a learned Critick;
 Camer. in 2. Epist. *Ἐμπόιστος τῷ Πνεύματι*, the *Spirit* of
 Per. v. 21. God did invade, enter and possess the
 Prophets; and upon that score, those
 Messages which they delivered and
 left upon Record, are commonly stiled,
 Ἀγία γραφή Γράμματα, *Holy Writ-*
 ings;

Writings; or as *Dionysius* calls them, *Θεολογία*, the Discourses, Speeches, or Word of God.

And because that blessed *Spirit*, by whom the Prophets, Evangelists and Apostles were inspired and acted, is the *Spirit of Christ*, well may the whole Scripture, as well the Old Testament as the New, be stiled according to that Expression of *St. Paul*, *Λόγος Χριστοῦ*, the Word of Christ; so much doth *St. Peter* yet further assure us in that fore-named place, where he saith, *The Spirit of Christ was in the Prophets*. And the same *Spirit* was in the *Apostles* too; that it should be so, their Lord had given them several Promises, *The Spirit shall guide you into all truth*; and again, *The Holy Ghost shall teach you all things*; and that these Promises were in their due time fully accomplished, *St. Luke* tells us, *They were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other Tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance*.

In short, the sum of my present Argument is this: The God of *Israel* was he, who inspired the *Prophets* of the *Old Testament*, and the *Apostles* of the *New*; but he who thus inspired them, was not God the *Father* alone, but his blessed *Spirit* too; and since this blessed

Spirit

Spirit is as shall hereafter be sufficiently proved, a *Person distinct* from God the *Father*; this consequence is undeniable; namely, that the God of *Israel* was and is more than *one* in Person. For, the *Creatour* of the World, which was the *Son*; and the *Inspirer* of the Prophets and Apostles, which was the *Holy Ghost*, were the God of *Israel*, as well as God the *Father*.
Quod erat demonstrandum.

S E C T. IX.

IN his next Page, this Author makes this demand, wherein there lyeth an Argument, such as it is, against the Divinity of Christ. *How can he be God himself, who truly is the Son of God? If he be the Son only, 'tis plain that he is not the Father also, who alone is God; so he, to which I shall reply in four particulars;*

I. This Man doth here again, *petere principium*,— he takes that for granted, which we *deny*, and he can never prove; I mean that the *Father alone* is God; and upon that false Supposition he grounds that Argument, whereby he would

against a Devilish Poyson.

79

would prove that Christ is not God.

2. Whereas this Man saith that the Son cannot be the Father, we easily grant it, for we do not only allow, but can prove a distinction of their Persons.

3. This Man doth in effect, affirm that Christ cannot possibly be God, for this Reason, because he is the Son of God. But what hinders? The Son of a Man is a Man, and why may not the Son of a God, as well be a God? There is indeed this difference in the case; the Son of Man is another Man, but the Son of God is not another God, but a God he is.

4. Whereas this Author makes this demand: *How can he be God himself, who is no other than the Son of God?* I shall now retort this Argument, and prove that our Saviour is most certainly the true God by that very reason, for which this Man saith, in effect, that he cannot be so. For, this Question of his, *How can he be a God, who is no other than the Son of God?* Implyeth a Negation that he is so, or an Impossibility that he should be so.

My present Argument then to prove that Christ is God, shall be this: God he is, and must be, because he is the
Son

Son of God ; a Son in that *peculiar* respect, wherein none else ever was, or ever can be so. And, for that reason, doth St. *John*, whose design it was, as well by that *Title* as by other *Arguments*, to prove the Deity of Christ, tell us, that our Lord stiled himself, *ὁς μόνος γεννῆς*, God's *only begotten Son*, a Title, which doth clearly distinguish him from all other Sons, either by *Creation* or *Adoption*, and advance him infinitely beyond them ; nay, our Lord's own filial relation to God, in respect of his wonderful Incarnation, is not so sublime, as to deserve this glorious Title, and to denominate him, *the begotten*, much less the *only begotten Son of God*.

Ravanell.
in verbo
gigno.

For to beget a Son, if Judicious Critics be not mistaken, is this, *ex substantia sua sibi similem producere*, it is for a Man out of his own substance to produce another like himself, consisting of an humane Body and a rational Soul ; a Body compleat in all his Parts, and a Soul endued with all those Powers and Faculties which are Essential to its being. Accordingly 'tis said of *Adam*,
Gen. 5. 3. *He begat a Son in his own likeness*, and so do all Men else ; they multiply themselves, they propagate their own image, their Sons are like them, sometimes

times in the external shape and form of their Bodies, but always in the number, order and situation of their Members, if Nature be not accidentally obstructed in her Operation.

And for this reason, St. *Basil* the Great defines a Father thus, *Πατήρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἑαυτοῦ τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ὁμοίαν ἑαυτοῦ φύσιν τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν*, a Father is he, who is to another the Original of being in a Nature like his own. And hence *Aristotle* tells, that to beget is this in general, *Τὸ ποιεῖσθαι ἑαυτὸν ὅσον αὐτῷ, ζῶον μὲν ζῶον, φυτὸν δὲ φυτὸν*; it is to make another as one's self, and so an Animal produceth an Animal, a Plant brings forth a Plant, a Man begets a Man, every Creature one of its own kind.

Now then, if this be so amongst all Creatures, much more must it be so with God, if that of the *Lyrick* Poet be true, *Horat. l. 4. ode 4.* who saith, *Est in jurencis, est in equis patrum, virtus*; if he who begets another, doth derive and communicate his own Nature, with all its *Essential Properties* and *Natural Perfections* to him who is begotten; then, I think that in the strict and proper Sense of this Notion, our blessed Lord, considered in his humane Nature, cannot well be called the begotten Son of God.

'Its

'Tis true, Christ as *Man*, was and is the *Son* of God ; but not by an Act of proper *Generation*, for God did not, and indeed, could not communicate to the *humanity* of his *Son* all those *Excellent* and *Essential Perfections*, which are found in, and proper to his own *Deity*; the *Father* is *Eternal*, *Omniscient*, *Omnipotent*, *Immenſe* ; but the *Son* as *Man*, is not, could not be ſo. And ſince the entire *Nature* of God was not, could not be communicated to Christ in his *Incarnation*, as the *Nature* of every *Father* is to every begotten *Son* ; I think, we may ſafely ſay, that our Lord, as *Man*, in the uſual and proper *Senſe* of that *Term*, cannot be rightly called the *Son* of God by *Generation*.

It is true, our Lord's *humane Nature* is ſtil'd by an Angel before its *Conception*, *To γεννησθαι*, which we render, *Luk. 1. 35. That which ſhall be born* ; and after its *Conception*, 'tis called, *To γεννηθηναι*, which we render, *Matt. 1. 20. That which is not begotten, but conceived* ; and the truth is, though the Greek Verb, *γενναι*, do ſignify, *to beget*, in its *Active Voice*, yet in its *Paſſive* and middle *Voice*, it ſignifieth, *Nasceri, oriri*, to be born, to ariſe, ſpring and receive an *Original* from ſuch or ſuch a thing or Perſon, which

which doth not alway require, nor can it in our case admit an act of proper Generation.

St. Paul, mentioning the Incarnation of Christ, tells us that he was, *Ἐκ γυναικός*; i. e. not *genitus*, but *factus*, not begotten, Gal. 4. 4. but made of a Woman. The Prophet fore-telling the same thing, words it thus, *The Lord hath created a new thing*, But what new thing was that? *A Woman shall compass a Man*, the framing of our Lord's humane Nature in a Virgin's Womb is here expressed as an Act, not of Generation, but of Creation; not an immediate and proper Creation out of nothing; but as Adam's Body is said to be created, because formed, *ex materia inhabili*, of the dust of the ground, which was so unlikely and untoward matter; so our Lord's Body, being made of the Virgin's Substance alone, without the usual concurrence of Man, may well be said in the same Sense to be created too.

And if our Lord, as Man, cannot in strict propriety of Speech, be called, the Begotten, much less can he in the same Capacity be called, the only begotten Son of God. We grant indeed, that our Lord in an allusive and metaphorical Sense, is stiled, the begotten Son of God, by
 vertue

vertue of his *Resurrection*; the *Grave* being likened to a *Womb*, and the Person raised by the Power of God to a second Life, being represented as one that is newly born. To this purpose St. Peter interprets that of the Psalmist, *Thou art my Son this day*, the day of his Resurrection, *have I begotten thee*. But in this improper Sense, our Lord is not an *only* begotten Son; for God hath already had, and hereafter will have many more such begotten Sons, who are called *the Children of God, being the Children of the Resurrection*.

Again, should we allow that in this *Metaphorical* Sense, our Lord might be called the *begotten* Son of God, by vertue of his *Conception* in the Womb of a Virgin, by the wonderful Power of God; yet neither in this respect can he be called an *only* begotten Son; for although no Man else was ever conceived and born of a Virgin; yet there was another Man formed, produced and enlivened by as great an Act of God's Omnipotence, and that gave him a right to this Title, *Adam, the Son of God*. And if the Wonder of our Lord's Conception and Birth might give him the Title of God's begotten Son, I see no reason, why the wonder of *Adam's* production

Act. 17.
33.

Luke 20.
36.

Luk. 3. 38.

duction should not render him capable of the same Title too.

Nay more, the Making of *Adam's* Body seems to be a more immediate and greater Act of Omnipotence, than the making of the Body of Christ; as Christ was, as to Men, *'Amirop*, without a *Father*; so was *Adam*, *'Amirop* & *'Amirop*, without *Father* and *Mother* too. I know, the Earth is stiled, *Magna Mater*, the Great Mother, but not of Men; the *Enyspeis*, *Terrigena Fratres*, the Giants born of the Earth are but Poetical *Fictions*. The dust of the Earth, was not so likely matter to make *Adam's* Body, as the Virgin's Flesh and Blood were to make our Lord's; in the Creation of *Adam*, God did all, the dull Earth was wholly Passive; but doubtless, towards the Incarnation of Christ, the blessed Virgin being first impregnated by the Holy Ghost, did as much as other Mothers are wont to do; there was from her a Vical and Active Concurrence with that Holy Spirit; who was, not *Semen*, the Seed it self; but *loco Seminis*, instead of the Seed, the Virgin's Womb being the Soil, in and out of which our Lord's Body, that Sacred Embryo, was formed, enlivened, nourished and prepared for its Nativity.

F

Now

Now then, if the *Creation of Adam* were at least as wonderful a Work as the *Incarnation of Christ*, since they were both effected by the same Almighty Power; and yet the one in the nature of the thing seems somewhat more difficult than the other; methinks if the easier Work, that of the *Incarnation*, be sufficient to denominate our Lord, the *begotten Son of God*, as being incarnated by his Power; then the harder Work, that of *Adam's Creation*, may as well give him a right to the same Title, as being treated by an higher Act of the same Omnipotence.

And yet notwithstanding all this, 'tis evident that our Lord is called, and therefore really is, the *only begotten Son of God*; and since he cannot be so called, nor so be, as he is *Man*, he must be so called and so be, as and because he is *God*, even by an *eternal Generation*. For 'tis evident from a variety of Texts, that this Son of God had a being from Eternity; for St. *John* saith of him, *In the beginning was the word, i.e. before all time*; so much doth the next Verse prove, *All things were made by him*, if so, then *time* it self is one of his Creatures. St. *Paul* also tells us, *All things were made by him and for him*, and thence he immediately

mediately infers his Omnipotence and Eternity, and tells us in the very next words, *He is before all things; and by him all things consist*; certainly, 'tis not possible for any Man to invent words more plain, and express to convince us, that our blessed Redeemer is in reality in a literal and proper sense, the great *Creator* and *Upholder* of the Universe; which are such sublime Titles, as could by no means belong unto him, were he not indeed the Eternal Son of God.

And if our blessed Saviour be, as undoubtedly he is, the *eternal Son* of God, then must he needs be of the same *Nature* and *Essence* with God his *Father*; he must be God, as his Father is; Why else doth St. Paul stile him, *The express* Heb. 1. 3 *image of his Person, and the brightness of his Glory*? We see that every Creature communicates its own Nature to its own Issue; an Horse to its Colt, a Sheep to its Lamb, and every Man to his begotten Son. And if through the Ordination and Concurrence of God's blessing, it must be thus with all sorts of Creatures; if a Sheep beget a Sheep, if a Man beget a Man, we may easily conclude, that since a *God* begets a *Son*, he begets such a Son, as is in all respects like himself; a Son, who is a God, but

though another Person, yet not another God. For the Generation of the Son is nothing else, but the full and entire Communication of the Divine Nature to him; and because that Nature is Infinite and Indivisible, it must be wholly communicated without any multiplication of the Deity. So that *three Persons*, being of one and the same Nature, the same not only in kind, but number, are but *one* God; so is the Son, because eternally begotten of the Father; and so is the Holy Ghost, because eternally proceeding from both.

Now, since our blessed Saviour is therefore God, because he is proved the *Eternal*, and is called the *only begotten Son of God*; How came this Author to make this demand; *How can he be God, who is no other than the Son of God?* Why might he not as well demand, *How can he be a Man, who is no other than the Son of Man?* But to answer this Man's demand with another, I ask, *How can he, who is the eternal, natural and only begotten Son of God, How can he in that Capacity, be any thing else but God?* For he cannot be, as yet he is proved, either the eternal and natural, or, as he is called, the *Only begotten Son of God*, as he is *Man*.

S E C T.

S E C T. X.

BUT altho' the Deity of our blessed Saviour be clearly asserted in several Texts, and evidently proved by his being the *eternal and only begotten Son* of God, and the undoubted *Creator* of the Universe; yet this *Socinian* Scribler makes bold to lay down this Proposition, and to tell the World in plain Terms, *That Christ is not the true God; Audis, Jupiter hoc, nec labra moves?* 'Tis infinite Patience that our Lord bears with such Blasphemers.

This heretieal Opinion hath been justly condemned by *Councils, Fathers, School-men*, and many other pious and learned *Divines*, who have written in defence of the contrary Doctrine, and lived and died in the Faith of the glorious *Trinity*. But, alas! the whole number of these Excellent Persons must now truckle and submit their Judgments to this grand *Theologue*, the *Clock-maker*. But that they and we may do so, this *Mechanick* and *Apron Divine* must produce better Arguments to disprove the Divinity of Christ, than any of his Predecessours or Modern Abettors as yet have done;

now, to make good as he thinks, this heretical Proposition, *That Christ is not the true God*, he takes a double course;

1. This Man propounds some Arguments, such as they are, to disprove the Deity of Christ. 2. He endeavours as well as he can, to answer those Arguments, which are commonly urged by our Orthodox Divines to prove it.

The Arguments which this mighty Disputant urgeth to disprove the Deity of Christ are these Three; 1. *Christ, saith he, is not God, because he hath a God above him.* 2. *Because what he did, he did by a power received from God.* 3. *Because God and he are plainly distinguished;* and to make good each of these, he cites several Texts, which yet will do him but little Service. And by the way let me tell the Reader, that this Man is but a sorry Artist, if the works of his hand, in his own Craft, be not far better than this of his head, if he do not use his common Tools much better than his Pen; and if the Motions of his Springs, Wheels and Clocks, be not more regular and true than the Arguments and Assertions of his Book. And now let us examine them one by one as they lie in order.

1. The

1. The first Argument which this Man urgeth to disprove the Deity of Christ, is this, *Christ, saith he, is not the true God, because he hath a God above him*: This Argument, if put into another form, must run thus;

That Person, who hath a God above him, cannot himself be the true God. But Christ is a Person, who hath a God above him. *Ergo*, He himself cannot be the True God.

The force of the *major* Proposition depends upon this undoubted Truth; namely, that the true God is the most High and *Supreme* Being; and he who is the *Supreme*, can have none *above* him; if therefore Christ have a God *above* him, he is not the *Supreme* Being, and consequently not the *True God*; that is all the strength of this *major* Proposition.

The truth of the *minor* Proposition, which saith that *Christ hath a God above him*, is evident from several Texts; St. Paul saith, *The Head of Christ is God*; 1 Cor. 11. and our Lord himself doth freely acknowledge thus; *My Father is greater than I*, and if he be greater, then must he needs be above him.

This Argument seems to our Author to be so clear and strong, that he ven-

tures to say, 'Tis evident beyond contradiction, and yet I shall make bold to contradict it; for 'tis grounded upon a fallacy; it proceeds, *à dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter*, when St. Paul saith, *The Head of Christ is God*; and when our Lord saith, *My Father is greater than I*: These and the like Texts speak of Christ as he is, the *Mediator betwixt God and Man*, as he is the *Man Christ Jesus*; and who doubts but God is greater than the best of Men?

And that these Words of Christ, *My Father is greater than I*, are not to be understood, *simpliciter*, simply, absolutely, and upon all accounts whatsoever; but, *secundum quid*, in a Relative and restrained Sense, we have the Judgment of far better Interpreters than our *Clock-maker*, or any of his Abettors, can with any modesty pretend to be. There is a twofold relation to Christ, wherein these words are thought to stand: 1. As he is the *Son of God*. 2. As he is the *Son of Man*.

1. Some think that these words were spoken by Christ in relation to himself, as being the *Son of God*, *My Father is greater than I*, But how so? Great St.

Adv. Ev. Basil answers, *Ου μωραδα, ε χειρον, εδω νομ. l. 4. αζιωμεν, εδω δυναμεν*; and so Athanasius,

sius,

fius, Μείζων ἢ μέγιστος, ἢ χεῖρον, &c. The *Atbanas. adv. Ars- anos. Or. 2. p. 365.*
 Father is greater than the Son, but not in respect of *Majesty, Time, Dignity or Power*; But how then? *St. Basil* answers, *Basil. M. adv. Eunom. l. 10. p. 35.*
Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἡ Ἀρχὴ τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τὸ τοῦ μείζων ὁ Πατήρ, ὡς αἰκθ. καὶ Ἀρχὴ διὸ καὶ ὁ Κύριος. ὅπως εἶπεν ὁ Πατήρ με μείζων με εἶπεν, καὶ ὁ Πατήρ διὰ τοῦτο.
Gregory Nazianzen in effect saith as much, *Greg. Nazianz. Or. 1. p. 17.*
Τῷ Πατρὶ τοῦ ἀρχῆς ἀξίωμα ὡς Πατὴρ καὶ ὑπόστασις. The substance of which Words is this; namely, that God the Father is said to be greater than the Son in regard of his *Paternity*, as he is the *Original* and *Fountain* of the Deity; as he is the only Person, who communicates the Divine Essence to the Son.
St. Chrysostom, mentioning this Exposition of our Saviour's Words, approves it so far, as to say, *Οὐκ ἀντιφύκει*, we will not contradict it. *Theophylact* also mentions, and doth not blame this Interpretation of the Text, *Μείζων ἔστιν ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ αἰκθ. καὶ ἀρχὴ με εἶπεν, ὅτι αὐτὸς γὰρ γεννημένος*; My Father is greater than I, as being the Original of my Person, for, of, and by him, I was begotten.

In the same Sense doth *St. Austin* interpret these Words of Christ, *My Father is greater than I*, But why so? *St. Austin*
Augustin. de Fide & Symb. tom. 3. c. 9.

Austin gives this reason, *Quia Filius debet Patri quod est*; because the Son oweth his very Being to the Father. *Tertullian* useth this Text as an Argument to prove the distinction of Persons betwixt the Father and the Son; *Pater alius à filio, dum filio major*, the Father must needs be distinguished from the Son, since he is greater than he; and upon what score he is greater, he seems to intimate in his next Expression, *Alius qui generat, alius qui generatur*, he who doth beget is one, and he who is begotten is another. The same account is given us by *St. Hilary*, as *Erasmus* cites him, why the Father is greater than the Son; he is so, *Ratione principii, quia à patre filius*, because the Son originally received his Divine Nature from the Father.

Tertull.
adv. Prax.
c. 9. p. 504.

Erasm. in
Job. 14. v.
28.

But although the Father be supposed greater than the Son in respect of his own Paternity, and his Son's Filiation, yet upon any other account he is not so; thus must we understand that Expression of *St. Hilary*, *Patrem esse majorem filio, filium tamen non esse minorem Patri*; though the Father, *eo nomine*, as such, be greater than the Son, *quà talis*, as the Son, yet in other respects, the Son is no less than the Father. For, *Natura aequalis est Patri, & in Divinis Personis*

sonis ordo quidem est, inequalitas non est,
the Son in *Nature* is equal to the Fa-
ther; for though amongst the Divine
Persons there be a distinction and prio-
rity of *Orders*, yet there is no *inequality*.
So *Erasmus*. But

2. There is yet another more com-
mon, and indeed more probable Inter-
pretation given us of these words, *My*
Father is greater than I, i. e. than I as
being the Son of *Man*. 'Tis true, our
Lord, as *Man*, was entrusted with a very
large Authority here below; but when
he was to leave the World, his Apo-
stles being sorely troubled for the speed-
y loss of their dear Lord and Master,
to revive and raise their drooping Spi-
rits, he gave them this assurance, *I go to*
my Father, and your Father; that Father
of mine and yours, *who is greater than I*,
much more able to assist you in all your
Sufferings, and to supply all your
Wants.

And that when our Lord delivered
these words, *My Father is greater than I*,
he spake of himself as *Man*, is the general
persuasion of the best Interpreters which
I can meet with *Ἐπειδὴ ἀνθρώπου γέ-
γονε, μέζονα αὐτῷ λέγει τὸν πατέρα*; when
our Lord was once become a *Man*, then
he said that his Father was greater than
he,

Athan. de
humilitat.
Christi. p.
614.

Theophyl. he; so *Athanasius*. And thus *Theophylact*,
in Job. 14. *Kατὰ τὴν ἀνθρώπου μείζων αὐτὸ λέγεται*
 28. ὁ πατήρ; the Father is said to be greater

than the Son in regard of the Son's hu-
August. de manity. Of the same mind was *St. Austin*,
Tren. 1. 1. who saith of this and other like Texts,
 c. 7. *Propter Incarnationem verbi Dei ita dic-*

curtur, ut majorem filio Patrem signifi-
cent, &c. they are so spoken, as to im-
 port that the Father is greater than the
 Son, only by reason of the Son's In-

Zeger. in carnation. *Zegerus* expounds this Text,
locum. as if our Lord had plainly said, *Ob cor-*

poris hujus corruptibilitatem Patre sum fa-
ctus inferior, I am become inferiour to
 my Father in regard of this my corrup-
 tible Body. But what need I mention

any particular Authorities, since *Maldon-*
ate, having named a great number of
 very judicious Expositors, plainly tells
 us, *Omnes in eo conveniunt, Christum ut*
Hominem loqui; they do all agree, that
 when our Lord said, *My Father is greater*
than I, he spake of himself only as he
 was *Man*.

Nor can we doubt but these learned
 Men were led to this Interpretation of
 the Text by their consideration of that

Phil. 2. 6, which *St. Paul* saith of Christ, *Who, be-*
 7. *ing in the form of God, thought it not*
robbery to be equal with God; but made
himself

himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made in the likeness of Men. This Text represents our blessed Saviour in a double Capacity; First, as one being in the form of God; and Secondly, as one being in the form of a Servant, and in the likeness of Men; by which words, saith Oecumenius, *Πᾶσαι ἡρταλύνονται αἱ Ἀιρέσεις;* *Oecumen. in locum.* all the Heresies which arose concerning the Person of Christ, are dissolved and overthrown; and particularly that of Arius, Marcion, Paulus Samosatenus, Nestorius and Sabellius, to which we may justly add, that of Socinus too. For this Text doth clearly import and express our Lord's being in the form of God; But what is that? *Μορφή Θεοῦ φύσις Θεοῦ;* the form of God is the nature of God; so Oecumenius. And thus Theophylact, *Μορφή Θεοῦ ἡ ὕψια λέγεται, ὡς καὶ μορφή δούλου, ἡ φύσις τοῦ δούλου;* *Theoph. in locum.* as the Nature and Condition of a Servant is here called, the form of a Servant, so the Essence or Substance of God is here stiled, the form of God. St. Chrysostom gives the same Interpretation too, *Μορφή δούλου φύσις δούλου μορφή Θεοῦ φύσις Θεοῦ;* *Chrys. in locum.* the form of a Servant imports the nature of a Servant, and so the form of God imports the nature of God. This Text thus understood (and otherwise

wife understood it cannot be) doth *St. Chrysostom* apply to, and urge against several Hereticks, and utterly confounds them by it.

And indeed, well he might ; for one would think that a Man who denieth the Deity of Christ, should be ashamed of himself and abhor his Opinion, when *St. Paul* so plainly tells him, that Christ *being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.* Certainly, if it had been Robbery, our Lord must have thought it so ; for, Could he who is Wisdom it self be mistaken ? No, our Lord well knew that his claiming an equality with God, was so far from being an unjust *Usurpation*, that it was indeed his *natural* and undoubted *birth-right*.

But if our Lord be indeed *equal with God*, as *St. Paul* affirms, How comes our Saviour himself to tell us, *My Father is greater than I* ? Can there be a *Majority* and yet an *Equality* too ? Or doth *Christ* and *St. Paul* clash and contradict one another ? No such matter, there is a very fair Correspondence between them, and their different Expressions are very easily reconciled, and *St. Paul* himself here tells us how. For he represents our Lord, 1. As being in the *form of God*.

2. As

2. As being in the form of a *Servant*, and made in the likeness of *Men*; and from hence *St. Austin* took just occasion to resolve this Riddle thus, *In forma servi*, August. de Trin. l. 1. c. 7. *quam accepit, minor est Patri; in forma autem Dei, in qua erat etiam antequam hanc accepisset, aqualis est Patri*; our Lord considered in the form of a *Servant*, which he took upon him, is *inferiour* to his Father; but considered in the form of *God*, which he had before he took that of a *Servant*, he is his Father's *Equal*.

And the truth is, when our Lord took upon him the nature of *Man*, he therein became less, not only than his *Father*, but even, *ἰαυρόν*, saith *St. Chrysostom*, less even than himself; nay, as *St. Paul* saith, *He was made, ὡς ἑνὶ π.* a little lower than his *Angels*; for saith the Text, *ἰαυρόν ἐκένωσεν, exinanivit, he emptied himself*: He laid aside the splendour and glorious Majesty of his *Godhead*, and concealed himself under the *Disguise* and Raggs of *Man's Mortality*. And when once he had degraded himself so far below his *Native Dignity*, as to say, *I am a Worm and no Man*; it is no wonder, that being in so mean a condition, he should tell his *Apostles*, *My Father is greater than I*.

But

But although when our Lord became Man, he was pleased to lay aside the lustre of his Deity, yet did he not lose any thing of it; for, *Cum inciperet esse, quod non erat, remansit quod erat*; when he began to be, what before he was not, he still continued what before he was; for as St. *Augustine* saith, *Divinitas in Trin. l. 1. Creaturam non est mutata, ut desisteret esse Divinitas, nec Creatura in Divinitatem, ut desisteret esse Creatura*; our Lord's Divine Nature was not changed into the Humane Nature, and so ceased to be the Divine; nor was his Humane Nature changed into the Divine, and so ceased to be Humane. But when our Lord became, *Τέλειος Ἀνθρώπου*, a Perfect Man, he still continued, *Τέλειος Θεός*, Perfect God; so that we may conclude as Great St. *Basil* doth, that this Expression of Christ, *My Father is greater than I*, *Ἐλάττωσιν τῷ εἰπόντι ὁ δέοντι*, doth not import an absolute and universal minoration of him who said it. But that notwithstanding this Expression, as the same Father speaks, *Ὁμοῦσι ὁ πατήρ τῷ υἱῷ καὶ μείζων λέγονται*, the Father is of the self same Substance and Essence with the Son, though in some other respects, he is truly said to be greater than he.

And

Basil. M. adv. Eunom. l. 4. p. 100.

And now 'tis time to tell this Author, that the *major* Proposition, couched in his Argument, which runs thus, *That Person who hath a God above him, is not, cannot himself be God*; being absolutely and universally understood, is utterly false; and to make it true, this addition is required, *That Person, who hath a God above him, cannot himself be the true God, and nothing else*; but if he may be *something else*, which is *less* than *God*, which is our Saviour's Case, then must he have a God *above* him, and yet himself be the *true God* notwithstanding.

That our Lord is indeed *somewhat else* than *God*, this Author will not deny, for he asserts that he is a *Man*, and no more; but since by clear Texts and infallible Arguments, he is proved to be *God*, our Adversary willingly grants him to be a *Man*; our Lord, being not *only* *God*, but *Man* too, might well say, in regard of that *inferiour* Capacity of his, *My Father is greater than I*; but on the other hand, in regard of his *Divine* Nature *St. Paul* tells us, *He thought it no robbery to be equal with God*; and since he thought so, who knew very good reason for it, I see no cause why we should not think so too.

G

That

That Confession of Faith, which passeth under the Name of the *Athanasian Creed*, delivers that Truth, which the Devil and his suborned Disputers will never be able to overthrow, when it tells us, that our Lord, *As touching his Godhead is equal to the Father; and inferiour to the Father, as touching his Manhood.* For, though he have a God above him, considered as the Son of *Man*; yet considered as the *eternal and only begotten Son of God*, he hath none above him; for though there be betwixt the Father and the Son a *Priority* and a *Posteriority* in respect of Order; yet as there is no such thing in respect of *time*, so there is nothing of *inequality* in respect of *Nature*, *Essence*, or any of those Perfections which are inherent in it, and inseparable from it.

So then, if our blessed Saviour, as being somewhat *else* than God, may have a God above him, and yet be the *true God* notwithstanding; our Author's *major Proposition* being utterly false; his *Conclusion*, *That Christ is not God*, can never be true. And so much in answer to his first Argument.

S E C T.

S E C T. XI.

TH E second Argument which this Author urgeth against the Divinity of Christ, is this, *Christ*, saith he, *is not God, because what he doth, is by a Power received from God.* This Argument put into some form, runs thus ;

That Person, who acts by a Power received from God, cannot himself be God. But Christ acted by a Power received from God; *Ergo*, Christ cannot be God.

'Tis most certain, that he, who is God, doth always act by his own Power ; his Omnipotence is not borrowed, but it is one of those natural and essential Perfections, which belong to, and are inseparable from his Godhead. So that whosoever acts by a borrowed Power, and such a Power only, cannot be God ; and so far the major Proposition is true, and proves that *Moses* and the *Prophets*, and our Lord's *Apostles*, who did many Miracles, but by a Power which was not their own, but only lent them, were no more than *Men*.

But if by this *minor Proposition*, *Christ acted by a Power received from God*, this Author means (and mean so he must, if he mean any thing to his purpose) that our blessed Saviour in the time of his Incarnation wrought all his Miracles by a *borrowed Power*, and such a Power only, this Proposition is utterly false; and the Texts which this Man cites, can never prove it true.

We do easily grant the Truth of that
Job. 3. 2. Expression, *No man can do these miracles, which thou doest, except God be with him*; the Text imports that no mere Man could ever do such mighty Wonders, as our Lord did, by any *natural Power* of his own, and without the *supernatural Power* of God. We know and believe what
Matt. 28. 18. our Lord himself hath told us, *All power is given to me both in Heaven and in Earth*; we know that acknowledge-
Job. 17. 2. ment of his to his Father, *Thou hast given him power over all flesh*; and a-
Job. 5. 30. gain, *I can of my self do nothing*. These and the like Texts doth this Author cite to prove, that whatever our Lord did or doth, he did and doth by a Power only *lent* him by his Father, and none of his own. To which we answer thus.

We grant that those many Miracles which our blessed Saviour wrought, whilst

whilst he conversed in this lower World, were not done by any Power that was *natural* and properly belonging to his own *Humanity*, but derived from above; for, he himself tells us, *I with Luk. 11. the finger of God cast out Devils.* And that ^{20.} by a *Divine* Power he wrought all his other Miracles, the judicious Spectators easily and justly believed; so intimates the Evangelist, *When the multitude saw Matt. 9. 9. his miracles, they marvelled and glorified God, who had given such power unto men.* Now, saith this Socinian Author, *These things can in no tolerable sense be said of him, that is truly God.* But can they not with very good Sense be said of him who was truly *Man*, as well as truly *God*? And of Christ as being *Man*, are these things written.

So thought Gregory Nyssen, "Α εἶχε φησὶν ὡς Θεός, πάντα λαμβάνειν λόγον, ὡς γὰρ ὁμοῦ αὐθροπῶ; that Power which Christ had naturally, as being ^{Greg. Nyssen in Re surrect. Christi, Or. 2. p. 846.} God,; he is said to receive, as being made a *Man*. Theophylact expound- ^{Theoph. in Matt. 28. 18.} ing that Text, *All power is given unto me, &c.* makes this demand, Παρὰ τίνος; By whom was this Power given to Christ? His answer is this; Ἡ πᾶντι παρ' ἑαυτοῦ; verily it was altogether given him by *himself*; i. e. by his *Deity*

to his *Manhood*. Nor doth this contradict our Lord's address to his Father, *Joh. 5. 19. Thou hast given him power over all flesh*; for our Lord himself saith, *What things soever the Father doth, these also doth the Son likewise*. But how can the Son act, *ὁμοίως*, like the Father, if we shall suppose that the Son acts by another's Power, since the Father acts by his *Own*? But the truth is, as *Theophylact* well observes, there is betwixt the Father and the Son, *μία εἰς, μία δύναμις, μία ἐνέργεια*, one Essence, one Power, and one Operation; to which may be added, *μία βούλησις*, one Will too.

*Theoph. in
Joan. c. 3.
p. 629.*

The same Author expounding those *Joh. 5. 21. Words of Christ, As the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickens them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will, concludes thus, Πάντα εἰς αὐτὸν Πατρί* the Son is in all things like the Father, *Ἄντὴν ἑαυτοῦ, αὐτὴν δύναμιν*; he hath the self same Essence, the self same Power; and this he proves by those fore-named Words of Christ, *What things soever the Father doth, these also doth the Son likewise*; and from thence he thus infers, *Εἰ ὁ Πατὴρ μετ' ἑξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁμοίως, ἐκ αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύεται ὁ υἱὸς τῷ Πατρί*; If the Father act with Authority and Power, since the Son acts like him, he cannot

cannot be *inferiour* to him; i.e. in point of Power.

Now, that our blessed Saviour did indeed receive all his Power originally from his Father, is not to be denied; that Power which he shewed by creating the World some thousands of years before his Incarnation; and that Power which he shewed by working Miracles some years after it, were both received originally from God the Father. For God the Father did by an act of eternal Generation communicate to our Lord his only begotten Son, his own entire Essence, and with it all the Perfections belonging to it, of which Omnipotence is one. So that we may say as Maldonate doth, *Christum, etiam quatenus Deus erat, potestatem omnem sicut & naturam ipsam Divinam a Patre per eternam Generationem accepisse*; that Christ, even as God, received all his Power, even as his Divine Nature, by his eternal Generation from his Father. And surely, the reception of that Power which is inseparable from that Nature which he received, cannot ungod our Lord, but rather prove his Deity.

Maldon.
in Mart.
C. 28. 18.

And since God the Father did from Eternity communicate to his Son his own entire Essence, and with it his own

Omnipotence, we may justly say, that when this Son of his was pleased to take upon him the nature of Man, and in that nature to work many Miracles; the Power whereby he wrought them, though originally received from his Father, was then his own; exercised by himself as being *Man*, but received from himself, as being *God*.

So then, this Author's second Argument against the Divinity of Christ falls to the ground; for both his Propositions as he means them are utterly false; his major Proposition is this:

That Person who acts by a Power received from God, cannot be God himself. But this is false, for our blessed Saviour did at once receive from his Father his Godhead and his Power too; his Power, because his Godhead, from which his Omnipotence is inseparable. Again, his minor Proposition is this: *But Christ acted by a Power received from God; he means, from God the Father only.* But this is false too; for our Saviour being God, acted when he became a *Man*, by a Power which his *humanity* received, not only from his Father, but from himself also. And this I take to be a sufficient answer to, and confutation of this Man's second Argument.

S E C T.

S E C T. XII.

THIS Author's third and last Argument against the Divinity of Christ is this, *Christ, saith he, is not God, because God and He are plainly distinguished*; which Argument also may be put into this form;

That Person who is plainly distinguished from God, cannot be God himself, But Christ is so distinguished from God: *Ergo, He himself cannot be God.*

To prove a distinction betwixt God and Christ, this Man cites several Texts; and is so confident of the force of this present Argument, that he boldly saith, *This Consideration alone of it self is a very strong Argument to prove our Lord Jesus Christ not to be really and truly God, since he is every where spoken of as a Person that differs as much from God, as a noble Subject differs from his Prince or King: So he.*

But methinks this Man should be ashamed to publish such a notorious falsehood to the World, which every Man who reads and observes his Bible may so easily and so evidently contradict; Can he do less than blush when he reads his own blasphemous **Paper**, wherein
he

he saith, that the Scriptures do every where speak of Christ, as a Person that differs as much from God, as a noble Subject doth from his King? Our Lord is often stiled, the Son, and sometimes, the only begotten Son of God: and is the only Son of God no nearer to God his Father, than a Nobleman to his Prince? St. Paul saith, Christ thought it no robbery to be equal with God. But I am apt to think that it would be esteemed a great robbery, should some noble Subject claim an equality with his King. We read that Pharaoh King of Egypt, did advance Joseph to be the second Man in his Kingdom, the very Chief of all his noble Subjects; but yet he told him,

Gen. 41. *In the Throne I will be greater than thou.*
 40.
 Job. 1. 1. St. John saith of Christ, *The word was God*; and if he once was God, he is so still; And doth God differ as much from God, as a noble Subject differs from his Monarch?

Put, alas! 'tis this great Disputant's unhappiness, that he still argueth from a gross misapprehension of our Lord's most sacred Person, and is forced to defend an ill Cause, which is not capable of a just defence by fallacious Arguments, and taking and pleading notorious Falshoods, as if they were granted Truths.

Truths. For, though we have clearly proved that Christ is *truly God*, yet this blind *Beetle* still takes him to be a *Man* and *no* more; and in that Capacity to be distinguished from God, which none of us deny. Nay more, the *humane* Nature of Christ, though now, as *St. Paul* saith, *highly exalted*, even above the most glorious Angels, yet being a *Creature*, doth differ more from its great *Creator* than not only a *noble Subject*, but even the *poorest Peasant* differs from the *greatest Prince*. For though there be a mighty difference upon *Civil* accounts betwixt a *King* and a *Beggar* for a short time, yet since they naturally consist of the same *Materials*, they will e'er long be resolved into the same *Principles*, and levelled to an *equality* in the *Grave*. God Almighty, in the execution of his *Decrees*, and the dispensation of his *Providence*, is pleased to use Men of *several Orders*, even as we in casting up an *Account*, do use abundance of *Counters*; this Counter stands for *one*; that for *ten*; this for an *hundred*, that for a *thousand*; but when the *Account* is cast, they are all shuffled together, and then there is no difference in point of value betwixt that which stood for a *single unity*, and that which stood

stood for *thousands*. But because there is infinite distance betwixt the *Deity* and the *Humanity*, this difference can never be so reconciled, as to create any thing like an *equality* betwixt *Christ* as *Man*; and his *Father* being *God*.

But besides that difference which is betwixt the *nature* of *God* and *Christ* as *Man*, the Scriptures teach us, there is a difference between them upon some other scores, I mean, in point of *Relation* and *Personality*; for the *Father*, who doth beget, is not, cannot be the same in *Relation* or *Person* with the *Son*, who is *begotten*. This distinction we own, because the Scriptures do so; and by them we prove it against the *Sabellians*, who deny it. *St. John* saith, *The word was with God*, if so, the *Word* must be *one*, and that *God*, with whom he was, must be another. *Our Lord* saith, *I and my Father*; this imports a *distinction* of their *Persons*; for were they not *two*, they could not be thus coupled.

But although there be indeed such a distinction in point of *nature* betwixt *God* and *Christ*, as *Man*; and though there be a distinction in point of *Relation* and *Person* betwixt *God* as the *Father*, and *Christ* as his only and eternally begotten *Son*; yet the Scriptures do

do assure us, that upon some other account, there is a perfect *union* and *equality* between them, what else doth our Lord mean, when he saith, *I and my Father* John 10.
are one? How one? One in Consent.
 sent, saith the *Socinians*; and 'tis true, they are one in Consent, but not *only* so, nor is that the Unity intended in that Text; for our Lord means such an Unity as is proper and *peculiar* to himself, whereas an Unity in Consent is common to *glorious Angels* and *glorified Saints*. The Unity here mentioned, is the same with that which he means elsewhere, when he saith, *I am in the Father, and the Father in me*; which imports an U-John 10.
38.
 nion so close, that 'tis thus expressed in the original, *I and my Father are, or, one thing, one being*, and that must needs be the *Being* of God; for since the *Father* is granted to be God, the *Son* cannot be, *one thing*, with him, if he be not the same God too.

And thus is this Text interpreted by learned Men, *I and my Father are one*; How so? Great St. Basil answers, *Ζαφῶς* Basil. M.
τὸ ἐν αἰκῇ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ παντὸς καὶ ὁμοῦ adv. Eunom. l. 1. p. 35.
 'tis evident that this word, *one*, imports the *equality* and *identity* of their Power. The same Father saith again, *Εστὶ πῦρ* Id. p. 37.
ἑνὸς. ἃ τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν καὶ ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν.

Basil. M.
adv. Eu-
nom l. 4.
p. 92.

παρὰ τὸ αὐτὸ. This Expression of Christ doth declare the *Union* and *sameness* of his Nature with that of his Father. And yet again, elsewhere, *Ἐν ἡμῖν υἱοὺς ἑναι, τῷ αὐτῷ ὁμοῖον Πατέρα ἔχον*; our Lord means that his *Father* and *himself* are *consubstantial*, one and the same in substance. So St. Basil.

Athan. in
disputat.
adv. Ari-
um p. 116.

Id. in ead.
disput. p.
132.

Of the same Judgment was that great Man *Athanasius*, who tells us, that when Christ said, *I and my Father are one*; he intended by the word, *Are*, to intimate, *τὴν διὰ δα, the duality* of their Persons; and by the word, *one*, *τὸ ἓν τῆς οὐσίας, the unity* of their *Essence*. Again, the same Father saith, that our Lord spake these words, *I and my Father are one*, *Γινώσκων ἑαυτὸν μὴ διαστῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τὸ υἱοῦ, ἀλλ' ἑνωμένον τῷ Θεῷ ὡς τῷ Θεῷ Πατρὶ αὐτοῦ*, knowing that he himself did not differ from the *Father* in *Substance*, but was *united* to him in the *Godhead*. So *Athanasius*, and to the same purpose in many other places.

Greg. Nazianz. Or.
49. p. 719.

And with these agreeth that famous Divine *Gregory Nazianzen*, who expressly saith, that our Lord delivered these words, *I and my Father are one*; for this reason, *Ut duarum personarum vocabula unius Deitatis Majestatisque demonstraret*. that he might demonstrate the two Persons

sons

sons here named, *himself* and his *Father* to be *one* in *Deity* and *Majesty*. And again, *Unum ad unitatem Divinitatis refert; sumus autem personis assignat; our Lord refers the word, One, to the Unity of their Divinity; and the word, Are, to the distinction of their Persons.* And yet again, *Talis est filius, qualis & pater, non enim ipse unum cum Patre se diceret, nisi talem se de Patre, qualis est & Pater, sciret; the Son is such as the Father; for he would not have said, I and my Father are one; had he not known himself to be of the Father, and such as the Father is.* So this great Man.

To these may be added the Interpretation of *St. Chrysostom*, who tells us, that by these words, *I and my Father are one*; our Lord intimates, *Tò τῆς δυνάμεως ἰσότητος*, the equality of their Power; and thence he thus infers, *Ἐἰ ἡ δύναμις ἡ αὐτῆς, ἐνδελον ὁκ καὶ ἡ οὐσία*. If the Power of the Father and the Son be the same, 'tis very evident that their Essence is so too. Of the same mind was *Theophylact*, who expounds our Lord's words thus, *I and my Father are one; Κατὰ τὴν φύσιν, καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν, καὶ τὴν κτῆσιν*; one in Nature, Essence and Power. But no Man speaks more fully of this matter than *Gregory Nyssen*, who saith, that Christ and his Father are one,

Idem in eadem Or. p. 728.

Idem 16. p. 732.

Chrys. in Joan. c. 10. v. 30.

Theoph. in locum.

Greg. Niss. one, Ἐν Ἀληθείᾳ, Θεότηκ, Ὀυσία, Ζωή,
 adv. Eu. Σοφία, & πᾶσιν ἀπαξάπλως, in Truth,
 nov. p. 8.

Divinity, Essence, Life, Wisdom, and indeed in all things else. To these I shall add no more Testimonies from the Greek Fathers, save only this one from St. Cyril of Jerusalem, who saith that our Lord

Cyrl. Hierosol. in Catechesi 11. p. 99.

and his Father are one; Διὰ τὸ ἓν τὴν Θεότητα ἀξίωμα, ἐπειδὴν Θεὸς Θεὸν ἐγέννησεν; in the dignity of their Deity, because a God begat a God. Again, they are one, Διὰ τὸ ἓν τὴν βασιλείαν, ὃς ἄλλων βασιλεύει Πατὴρ, ἄλλων δὲ υἱός; in their Kingdom, for the Father doth not reign over some, and the Son over others. And yet again, they are one, Διὰ τὸ μηδενὶς ἐν διαφωνίᾳ, ἢ διάσειν. Οὐ γὰρ ἄλλα βυλήματα Πατρὸς, ἄλλα δὲ υἱὸς; because there is no dissention, no disagreement between them; for the Father doth not will one thing, and the Son another. And yet once more, they are one, Διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἄλλα Χεῖρς δημιουργήματα, & ἄλλα Πατρὸς; because their Operations are not different; the Son doth not do one thing, and the Father another. Thus far St. Cyril.

Of the same persuasion are the Latin Fathers, Commentators, and Criticks

Tert. adv. Prax. c. 22.

too; Tertullian tells us, that this saying, I and my Father, Ostendit duos esse, quos aequat

æquat & jungit, declares two Persons; whom it *equals* and joyns: But in what? That he tells us afterwards, *In una Virtute*, in one and the same Power.

St. *Austin* saith, that our Lord by these words, *I and my Father are one*, *Divinitatem suam Consubstantialem Patri ostendit*, declares his own Divinity to be Consubstantial with that of his Father.

August. de Trin. l. 4. c. 9. t. 3.

And again, this Expression, *I and my Father are one*; *secundum Substantiam dictum est*; it means their Unity in point of Substance; so thought St. *Austin*, and tells us so in many other places.

August. de Trin. l. 5. c. 3. t. 3.

And that these words ought to be so understood, *Zegerus* cites and interprets this Testimony from St. *Cyril*, which much confirms it, *Deus Pater. Mediator Dei & hominum dedit, ut sit ejus Filius*, *unigenitus*, *Deus de Deo, nec natura dissimilis, nec virtute inferior, nec duratione posterior*; & hoc gignendo dedit, quia *Deus verus Deum verum genuit*, &c. i. e. God the Father granted to our Mediator that he should be his only begotten Son, God of God, not unlike in Nature, not inferior in Power, nor behind him in Duration; and all this he gave him by an Act of Generation; for the true God begat a true God, &c. Now, if our *Soci-*

Cyril. citat. à Zeg. in Joann. c. 10. v. 29.

mans shall enquire how this was done,

H

I an-

Cyrl. Hier.
resol. c. 11.
p. 96.

I answer with St. Cyril, *Ἀνεξορίστως, & ὡς ὁ αὐτὸς μὲν*; in such an ineffable manner, as none knoweth but God himself alone.

In short, to name no more particular Authors, *Maldonate* expounding these words of Christ, *I and my Father are one*, tells us, *Catholici quidem omnes Essentiam dicebant significare*; all Catholick Writers were of this persuasion, and the Context warrants it, that the Unity here intended by Christ betwixt himself and his Father is an *Unity of Power and Authority*, and consequently of *Nature and Essence*.

Maldon.
in locum.

And now let us review this Socinian's Argument; Christ, saith he, is not God; but why not? His reason is this, *Because God and he are plainly distinguished*. To which I answer, three things; 1. God and Christ are indeed distinguished as Christ is *Man*, and God his Father is not so. 2. They are indeed distinguished in their *Persons, Relations, and Personal Properties*; for, the Father is not the Son, the Son is not the Father; the Son is begotten, the Father is not. But, 3. They are not at all distinguished in their *Nature and Essence*, or in any of those infinite Perfections which are inherent in it. Nor hath this Man cited any

any one Text, which in these respects doth prove any inequality between them.

Sure we are, that God Almighty by his Prophet stiles our Saviour thus, *The Man which is my Fellow*, his other self, the brightness of his Glory, the express Image of his Person: But how could Christ be God's Fellow, were he no more than $\psi\lambda\omicron\varsigma \alpha\nu\theta\epsilon\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$, a mere Man? St. Hierom renders this Text thus, *Virum coharentem mihi*; i. e. $\omega\epsilon\gamma\omicron\kappa\epsilon\gamma\alpha\mu\upsilon\delta\iota\omicron\nu$, the Man who adheres and is as it were glued to me, as being one with me; the Chaldee Paraphrase reads it, *Socium qui similis est*; God's Fellow who is like him; *Virum mihi coequallem*, so Vatablus, the Man who is my Coequal. Accordingly St. Paul saith of him, *He thought it no robbery to be equal with God*; so equal, that he himself tells us, *I and my Father are one*.

Hieron. in
Zach. c.
13. 7.

Vatab. ci-
tatur à
Cornel. à
Lapid. in
Zach. c.
13. 7.

So then, as we allow our Lord's distinction from God in one respect doth prove his Humanity, so doth his Unity with God in a far higher respect, as undoubtedly prove his Deity too; and if so, this Man's Argument is altogether insufficient and unconcluding.

S E C T. XIII.

THIS Author having spent all his Arguments against the Divinity of Christ quite in vain, appeals as his last refuge; *To that account which the Scriptures give of the Person of Christ.* But really that account which he thought fit to gather from thence and present to his Reader, is a very lame one: For, he hath only collected and culled out a great number of such Texts, as serve to prove what none of us deny, that Christ was really a Man. But in his great Prudence he quite leaves out of his Account all those Texts which call and prove him God, though there be many that do so; only he boldly asserts, 1. *That 'tis not said in Scripture so much as once, that Christ is God most High.* Nor, 2. *That he is one of that Sacred Three, which do constitute or make up the true Godhead.* So he. To both which Clauses we answer thus;

1. To the first we answer, That although the Scriptures do no where say, *totidem verbis*, in express Terms, that Christ is God *most High*; yet the Scripture doth say in clear Terms full as much

much as that amounts unto. St. John, saith of him, *This is the true God*; and if he be the *true God*, he must also be the *most High*, for the true God is but One.

2. To the second we answer likewise thus, Though the Scriptures do not use this Expression, *Christ is one of that Sacred Th ee, which do constitute or make up the Godhead*; yet it doth deliver the Truth intended by these words, in Terms equivalent: So doth St. John, when he tells us, *There are Three that* 1 Joh. 5. 7. *bear record in Heaven*, and those Three he names thus, *the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One*; *Ev, one Thing*, and that one Thing is God. The same Three Persons with the change of his own Title, doth our Lord mention in his prescribed Form of Baptism, where he names, the *Father*, the *Son* and the *Holy Ghost*, by whom we must needs understand the *Three Glorious Persons in the Godhead*; for if not, if the Father *alone* were God, then are we commanded to Baptize at once; *In the Name*, i. e. *at the Command*, or, *eis ovoua*, *into the Name*, i. e. the *Religion* and *Worship* both of *God* and *Creatures* too, which cannot be.

And methinks 'tis very strange that any Man of common Sense and Reason should read these Texts, and yet peremptorily assert, that the Scriptures do not so much as once affirm, that Christ, who is here called, the *Word*, the *Son*, being joyned with the *Father* and the *Holy Ghost* in both these and other Texts, is not, *One of that Sacred Three, which do constitute or make up the Deity*, as this Author words it.

But from hence this Man proceeds to consider, *The Primitive Confessions concerning Christ*: And here he tells us,
 1. Negatively, what they were not.
 2. Positively, what they were. 1. This Author tells us *Negatively*, that the Primitive Confessions concerning Christ were,

1. *Not that Jesus our Lord was equal to the Father in all kind of Divine Perfections.* And yet St. Thomas confessed him in these words, *My Lord and my God*; and St. Paul confessed him to be, *God blessed for ever*, and tells us, *That he thought it no robbery to be equal with God.* Indefinitely and universally equal without any restriction or limitation; for, he who doth equal God in any one of his Infinite Perfections, must equal him in *All*.

2. *Not*

Joh. 20.
28.

Rom. 9. 5.

Phil. 2. 6.

2. Not that Christ was God of the Substance of his Father, as he was Man of the Substance of his Mother: And yet the Scriptures acknowledge him to be the only begotten Son of God, a Title, which could never have justly belonged to him, had he not been begotten of his Father's Substance, and been no more than a Man born of the Virgin Mary. But,

2. This Author tells us positively thus, All that those first Confessions do contain, was this; That he was the Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour of the World: And then he closes his Discourse upon this Head with this Remark; Here is no Trinity in Unity, no God-man, no Hypostatic Union so much as mentioned, nor any of those hard and cramping Names, with which the Church of God hath been since perplexed. To which we answer thus,

This short Confession of St. Peter, Thou art Christ the Son of the living God, contains more in it than is expressed in those few words wherein it is delivered, and so needs an Explication. Those brief Commands of the Moral Law, Thou shalt do no murder, thou shalt not commit adultery, do forbid such other sins, and require such Duties as in the

Terms of the Law are not named. And accordingly our blessed Saviour, who best understood the meaning of his own Precepts, did give a larger Sense of these Commands than that, wherein the Expositors of the Jewish Church did ever understand them. And as our Lord saw it necessary to amplify and enlarge the short commands of the Moral Law, because the full extent of them was not apprehended by the Jewish Expositors; even so the Pious, Learned and Judicious Fathers of the Primitive Church, convened in several Councils; thought it fit, and indeed very necessary, to explain and illustrate this short Confession, relating to our blessed Saviour; because it was misunderstood, and being too much restrained, was made an occasion of Heresie, and that by Men of Parts and Learning, but too much wedded to their own Opinions.

This Confession of Christ, *Thou art the Son of God*; these Men referred only to our Lord's *Temporal* Conception and Birth, as being effected by the miraculous Power of God, enabling a Virgin beyond the common course of nature, to conceive and bear a Son; so they counted our Lord to be no otherwise the *Son of God*, than as he was the *Son of Mary* too;

too; as if he had never been the Son of God before his Incarnation.

Now, to obviate and prevent the growth of this *Heretical* and dangerous Opinion, the learned Fathers, who lived in that Age, wherein this Heresie began to spread, being zealous for God's truth and our Lord's honour, drew up an Explication of this short Confession: I mean, the *Nicene or Constantinopolitan Creed*, wherein there is nothing declared in relation either to the Person of Christ, or the Holy Ghost, but what is very agreeable to, and clearly warranted by the word of God.

And if all the matters declared in this *Creed*, compiled at first by judicious and pious Men, and still owned by the Catholick Church, may be proved by such and such Texts; then must we conclude, that this *Creed* is not, in its substance, a new Confession; but only an *illustration* or Explication of the *old* ones; it doth not impose upon us the belief of any new Doctrines, but tends to secure, *the faith once delivered to the* Jude 3. *Saints*, and to preserve the Professours of it from those dangerous Heresies, which arose in former times, and are now revived in this unhappy Age of ours.

But

But although this *Nicene Creed*, and that of *Athanasius*, as larger Confessions of the Christian Faith, were designed by very good Men, and to such very good ends ; yet they cannot escape the undeserved censure of this impertinent scribler , who, having transcribed several *short* Confessions, recorded in the Gospel ; immediately, in contempt of these *larger* Confessions, subjoyns these words, *Here's no Trinity in Unity*. And yet *St. John* very plainly saith, *There are Three, that bear record in Heaven ; and these Three are One*. If there be *Three*, there's an acknowledgment of the *Trinity* ; and if these *Three* be *One*, there's an acknowledgment of the *Unity* ; and since *St. John* doth own the *Trinity* and *Unity*, why should not our *Creeeds* and we do as much.

Again, this *Apron Schoolman*, referring to the *short* Confessions of the Gospel, saith, *Here is no God-man* ; And yet *St. Paul*, a far better both *Divine* and *Disputant*, in one place stiles our Lord, *the Man Christ Jesus* ; and in another place he calls him, *God blessed for ever*. Now, if we put these two Titles together, and do not look with this Man's Eyes, we shall easily find out a *God-man*.

But

But our Author goeth on, and saith, *Here is no Hypostatical Union; How?* none at all? Doth not St. John say, *The* ^{John 1.} *word was made flesh?* Doth not St. Paul ^{14.} *say, God was manifested in the flesh?* And ^{1 Tim. 3.} *doth he not say again, He took upon him* ^{16.} *the seed of Abraham, i.e. the Nature of Man?* Where we have a clear distinction betwixt the *Person assuming*, and the *Nature assumed*, *He took*, there's the *Person assuming*; but what did he take? *The seed of Abraham*: or, as 'tis said, elsewhere, *flesh and blood*. Now, I demand of this Author, who was this, *He*, who took upon him the Nature of Man? Not an *Angel*; I think, no body doth imagine; nor could it be a *Man*; for this, *He*, who took, must needs be supposed to have been in *Actual existence* before there was any possibility of such an Assumption. Tell me then, can a *Man*, who is in *present being*, be once imagined to take upon him the *same* nature a *second time*: if not, if it were, as most certainly it was, the eternal *Son of God*, who was made *Flesh*, who was manifested in the *Flesh*, who took upon him *Flesh and Blood*, according to these several Texts; then have we found in the Scriptures that *Hypostatical Union*, which this Author flouts at; we have

have found, though not the very *Terms*, yet, which is full as much, the *Thing* signified by them.

But though this *Socinian* Author cannot, or rather will not, see this *Hypostatical* union of the *Divine* and *Humane* Nature in the Person of Christ, which these forenamed Texts do so clerely evidence, yet many Men of better Eyes and sounder Judgments have discerned and maintained it beyond all contradiction, were not Men resolutely bent in defending their own false Opinions to oppose the Truth of Divine Revelation. St. *John* tells us, *The word was made flesh*, and from hence doth St. *Chrysostom* very justly infer that *Hypostatical Union*, which this Man denieth and scoffs at. St. *Chrysostom's* words

Chrys. in
Joan.
Homil. II. are these, Τῇ ἐνώσει καὶ τῇ συναφείᾳ ἐν ἑσιν
ὁ Θεὸς λόγος, καὶ ἡ Ἐκκλησία, ἡ συνήχθησαν γένε-
σιν, ἐπὶ ἀφανισμῷ τοῦ ἑσιν, ἀλλ' ἐνώ-
σεως ἀπρήτου καὶ ἀφράστου, τὸ δ' ὅπως μὴ
ζῆται· ἐκλήετο γὰρ, ὡς οἶδεν αὐτὸς, i. e. God
the word and flesh are one, not by any
confusion or disappearance of their dis-
tinct Substances, but by an ineffable
and unspeakable Union, into the manner
whereof enquire not; for they are
united, as he himself knoweth how.

Theo.

Theophylact, Expounding the same Text, saith thus of Christ: Εἷς καὶ ἁποστασὶν ἦγεν τὸ πρῶτον, ἀλλὰ δύο καὶ τὰς φύσεις, Θεὸς γὰρ καὶ ἀνθρώπος. Θεὸς ὁ φύσις καὶ ἀνθρωπίνη ἐστὶν ἀπ' αἰν. ἐν, εἰ καὶ οὐκ ἓνα θεωροῦντο, τὸν χριστὸν φημι. Christ is *one* in his person, though *two* in respect of his *natures*, as being *God* and *Man*. But the *Divine* and *Humane* Nature are not *one*, though found in one Person, *i. e.* in Christ.

Thus also writes *Gregory Nyssene*: *Gregor. Nyss. adv. Eunom. Orat. 1. pag. 56.*
 Ὁ λόγος ἑρξ ἡμῶν, ὅλῳ μὲν τῆς σαρκὸς τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἀνέλαβε φύσιν. The word being made flesh, did together with that flesh take upon him the entire Nature of Man. To the same purpose speaks *Gregory Nazianzene*: *Greg. Nazianz. Or. 51. p. 738.*
 μὲν τὸν ἀνθρώπον τῆς Θεότητος, ἀλλ' ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν δογματίζομεν. Πρῶτον μὲν ἐστὶν Ἀνθρώπον, ἀλλὰ Θεὸν καὶ ὅν μονογενῆ παλαιόν, ἀμυγῇ σώματος ὅτι τέλει ὁ καὶ ἀνθρώπον. We do not part the *Humanity* from the *Deity*; but believe Christ to be *one Person*; at first indeed no Man, but *God*, and the only begotten *Son* of *God* before all Ages, without a *Body*: but at length a Man.

And from the same Texts do the Writers of the *Latin Church* infer this *Hypostatical Union* of the *Divine* and *Humane*

Tertull.
de carne
Christi.
cap. 17.
Tertull.
adv. Prax.
c. 27.

Humane Natures in the Person of Christ, who is stiled by Tertullian, *Deus ex Deo, & ex carne hominis homo*, God of God, and Man of the flesh of Man. And elsewhere he calls him, *Deum & Hominem sine dubio secundum utramque substantiam in sua proprietate distantem*: God and Man without Controversie according to the substance of each Nature, yet distinct in their respective proprieties. Nova-

Novatian.
de Trin.
cap. 19.

tianus writes much to the same effect, *Filius Dei descendit, qui dum filium hominis in se suscepit, consequentè illum filium Dei fecit, quoniam illum sibi filius Dei sociavit & junxit*. The Son of God descended, who taking upon himself the Son of Man, did make that Son of Man the Son of God, because the Son of God did assume and unite the Son of Man to himself. So he.

These Authorities, I think, may be sufficient to convince this *Mechanick Divine*: that judicious Writers, very well versed in the Holy Scriptures, have found the *union* of the Divine and Humane Natures in the Person of Christ, most clearly delivered in several Texts, which can import no less, nor indeed any thing else. And methinks any Man, who hath his Reason about him, and any thing of Modesty left him, should

should even blush and be ashamed to say, since there is such Evidence against him, that this *Hypostatical Union* is no where owned in the Word of God. Nor will it excuse him to say, that the very *terms* are not there, since the *thing* it self, which is signified by them, most certainly is so.

S E C T. XIV.

IN his next Page this Author gives us an account of, *The undoubted Faith, on which the salvation of all Christians doth depend*, and tells us, that it is no other than this. *That we believe that Jesus is the Son of God. That we confess with our mouth, and believe in our heart, that God raised him from the dead, and some other particulars, which he names.*

But then he adds these words, *The Scriptures no where injoyn us to believe, on pain of Damnation, either that Jesus is God most high, or that he is both God and Man, or that he was eternally begotten of the Father.* It seems these are no Articles of this Man's Faith, though they are and ought to be of mine.

But

1 John 5.
10.

But let this Man tell us, whether we are not obliged to believe whatever God hath revealed for a Truth; certainly, whatever the Proposition be, if God assert it, though we know not how it should be so, yet we must not doubt it, for St. John saith, *He that believes not, makes God a liar, and surely there is danger enough in doing so.* Indeed, it is not necessary for us, to know, in order to our Salvation, whatever the Scriptures have delivered for a Truth; but there are some *Fundamental Truths*, which we are obliged to know and believe under the penalty of *damnation*; for, our Saviour himself hath said, *He, that believes not, shall be damned.*

Mar. 16.
16. j

Now, that these three Propositions, which this Man counts unnecessary, *That Jesus is God most high. That he is both God and Man. That he was eternally begotten of his Father,* are indeed *Fundamental Truths*, the belief whereof is generally necessary to Salvation to all such persons, as have been taught them; hath been, I think, the Judgment of the *Catholick Church*. So much may be inferred from those *Ancient Creeds*, which have been and still are received, as short *Systemes* of such *Doctrines*,

Grines, as are the grounds of saving faith, and the foundations of Christian practice.

That the *Apostles Creed* doth contain in it all the Articles of Faith, which are necessary to Salvation; and since it is short, probably very few, if any, but such; I think no Man will doubt, who believes that this *Creed* was first written by those *inspired men*, and afterwards delivered, as abridgments of the Christian Faith, to the several Churches which they had planted

The *Nicene Creed* and that of *Athanasius* were drawn up in after times, only as *Comments* upon, and *Enlargements* of, that of the *Apostles*; and especially those Articles, which were then opposed by several *Hereticks*; and none more than those, which relate to our blessed Saviours *Person*, his *Divinity* being denied by some, his *Humanness* by others; some affirming that he was a Man only, *putative*, not in *reality*, but in *Appearance*; others saying that he took upon him *Real flesh*, but without a *Soul*; his *Deity* instead of a *Rational Soul* enlivening, informing, and acting his *Humane Body*.

Now, those Articles, which concern our Lords Sacred Person, in the *Apostles Creed*

Creed run thus, *I believe in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.* Here we have an exprefs Testimony of our Lords *humanity*, for *Mary's* Son must needs be a Man. Here is also a very fair Testimony of our Lords *Divinity*, since he is stiled *God's* only, or, *Only begotten Son*. But because some, by a gross mistake, thought him capable of this Title, as he was *Man*, because he was the only person, that was ever Conceived immediately by the power of God, and born of a Virgin; they did not think this Article, as it runs in the Creed of the *Apostles*, to be a sufficient proof of our Lords *Divinity*. And, for that reason, the *Nicene Creed* explains it thus, *I believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God; God of God, light of light, very God of God; begotten, not made; being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made: and then our Lords Humanity is thus exprest, who for us men and for our Salvation came down from Heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made Man.* The same Article in the Creed of *Athanasius* is delivered thus, *The right faith is, that we believe and confess,*
that

that our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God is both God and Man; God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the Worlds, and Man of the substance of his Mother, born in the World; perfect God, and perfect Man, &c.

And that this is the General Faith of the Christian Church, and Antiently was so, is evident from some other Creeds;

for, as a learned Man observes, *Symbolum Joannes Ecclesiarum omnium fidem loquitur.* The Faith of all Churches is declared by their Creeds. If this rule be true, then

did the Mother Church of Jerusalem believe our Lord to be God and Man; witness that Article of her Creed, which was collected out of the Catechisms of S. Cyril, who was her Bishop.

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦ Χριστόν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονο-
γενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάν-
των αἰώνων, Θεὸν ἀληθινόν, δι' ἃ καὶ
πάντα ἐγένετο Σαρκοῦντα καὶ ἐνανθρω-
πισάντα. I believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all Worlds, the true God, by whom all things were made, who was incarnate and made Man,

So runs the Creed of Jerusalem. Much to the same purpose runs that Creed of Alexandria, which Arius himself subscribed and presented to Constantine the Em-

*Joannes
Cassianus
sit ab U^o
serio de
Symb.*

*Socrat.
Hist. Sect:
l. i. c. 26.
p. 61.*

peror. *Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν πατέρα Πάντο-
κράτορα, ὃ εἰς κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν
αὐτοῦ, τὸν ἐκ αὐτοῦ πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων
γεννημένον, Θεὸν λόγον, δι' ὃ τὰ πάντα
ἐγένετο, ὅτι ὁ τοῖς ὕδασι, καὶ τὰ ὅτι γῆς
τὸν κατελθόντα καὶ ἑαυτὸν δένοντα, &c.* We
believe in one God the Father Almighty.
And in the Lord Jesus Christ his Son,
begotten of him before all Ages, God
the Word, by whom all things were
made, both things in Heaven, and things
on Earth, who descended and was In-
carnate, &c. The same Articles are,
verbatim, recorded by *Sozomene*, who
tells us that this Creed was presented
to *Constantine* by *Arius* and his friend
Euzoius, who proved indeed two great
dissemblers:

*Sozomen.
Eccl. Hist.
l. 2. c. 27.
p. 485.*

Now that the Articles contained in
the *Nicene* Creed were not then *new* Do-
ctrines, but the *General* and undoubted
Faith of the Christian Church in its *for-
mer* Ages, is evident from that account,
which *Eusebius*, being one of that great
Council, and Bishop of *Cæsarea*, sent
to those of his own Diocese with a Co-
py of the Creed: for thus he assured
them, *Καθὼς παρελάβομεν ὅτι καὶ πρὸ
ἡμῶν ὁπισχόντων, ὃ ὅτι πρὸ πάντων
ἐγένετο, ὅτι ὁ τοῖς ὕδασι, καὶ τὰ ὅτι γῆς
τὸν κατελθόντα καὶ ἑαυτὸν δένοντα, &c.* Οὕτως
ἔ

*Socrat.
Eccl. Hist.
l. 1. c. 8.
p. 24.*

Ἐ νυν πιστευοντες τὴν ἡμετέραν πίστιν ὑμῶν
 παρασυναφισομεθα. We send you a Sy-
 steme of that Faith, which we received
 from the Bishops, who were before us,
 wherein we were Catechized and Ba-
 ptized, which we have learned out of
 the Holy Scriptures, and which we do
 still own and profess.

In short, So Authentick hath this
 Creed been always esteemed, that 'tis
 called *Evangelici Symboli Sacramentum*, Epiphan.
 Cit. ab
 Usserio de
 Symb.
à Domino inspiratum, ab Apostolis institu-
tum; so Epiphanius, Παρεδόθη ἀπὸ τῶν
 Ἀποστόλων, The Words and Explications
 are the Nicene Bishops, but the Matter and
 Doctrine contained in it are Apostolical.

So then these Antient Creeds, being
 compiled by judicious and pious Men,
 and warranted by the word of God, and
 designed to justifie these three Proposi-
 tions, which this Author denies; name-
 ly, That Jesus is God most high, That he
 is both God and Man, That he was eter-
 nally begotten of his Father: we may
 conclude, that these Propositions are not
 only real Truths, but Fundamentals; for,
 if not, why should so many hundred
 excellent Bishops and other learned Di-
 vines, met in several Councils, with one
 consent and upon mature deliberation,
 not only approve the Doctrines deli-

vered in these Creeds, but recommend them to the Churches then present, and transmit them to Posterity, as abridgments of the Christian Faith, fit and necessary to be embraced and professed by all succeeding Ages?

*Joseph.
Antiq.
Jud. l. 18.
c. 4 p. 621.*

To conclude this Head of Discourse, I shall make bold to lay down this Assertion: That whosoever denieth the Truth of *all* or any *one* of these three forenamed Doctrines; if he *bear* and *own*, he doth also *unjustly claim*, and *usurp* the name of a Christian. *Josephus*, mentioning our blessed Saviour, writes thus, Γίνεται καὶ τῶτον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς σφόδρα ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ, οἷός τε αὐτὸν λέγειν χρῆναι, ὡς καὶ πολλὰ δόξαν ἔργων ποιῆς. There was about that time one *Jesus*, a wise *Man*, if yet we may call him a *Man*, for he was the doer of many wonderful works. Now, if *Josephus*, who was a *Jew*, thought it might be unlawful to call our Lord a *Man*; can he be a right *Christian*, who thinks and saith that it is unlawful to acknowledg and worship him as *God*? Methinks what censure soever this *Author* may deserve, as to his Person, this *blasphemous Libel* of his does highly deserve the flames. 'Tis not very long, since a Book, Entituled *The naked Gospel*, was burnt at *Oxford*; a Book, wherein

wherein its Author did seem somewhat to favour the *Socinian* Heresie, and by some Expressions obliquely to question our Lords *Divinity*; but yet that Author did not, as this Man hath done, with a bare faced *Impudence* utterly denied the Deity of Christ, and done his utmost, though quite in vain, to overthrow it, telling the World over and over, that *Christ is not God most High*.

S E C T. XV.

IT is evident that this Author will by no means allow our Saviour to be the true God; but at length he is so kind to him, as to grant that he is, though a mere, yet not a *Common Man*; but a Man advanced above the highest *Angels*; as appears from his Discourse, which bears this Title, *Of the Transcendent Dignity of Jesus Christ*. But then in his next page he gives us this Caution, though our Lord be indeed a person of the highest dignity: *Tet, saith he, it is not justifiable to honour Christ falsely*. But is it not far less justifiable to dishonour Christ falsely, as every Man doth, who denieth him, that dignity of the

I 4 Deity,

Deity, which, if we may believe the Scriptures, doth justly belong unto him?

And here, to prevent an objection, which might be raised against him, this Author names, and gives an answer, such as it is, to that Text, which saith, *Job. 5.23. That we should honour the Son, As we honour the Father*; But, saith he, *this, As, doth here import no more Equality of Honour, than that Text imports an equality of Holiness, which saith, Be ye holy, As he, who hath called you, is holy*, So thinks this Author.

But let him tell me, whether this Particle *As* doth never import an Equality in any other Texts; it is true, when we are commanded to be *holy*, merciful, and Perfect, *as* God is; the thing then required is a *Resemblance* and imitation, *pro modulo nostro*, of these Excellencies, which are in God, but not an Equality, for of that we are utterly incapable. But when St. Paul gives us these commands, *Be ye followers of me, As I am of Christ*, and again, *Walk, As ye have us for an Example*; did St. Paul mean, that we should only in *some degree* imitate his Pattern, and not *fully* come up to and match his Example in the Virtues of our Lives and Conversations?

Though

Though *St. Paul* himself could not exactly reach the Example of *Christ*, yet 'tis possible for us quite to reach the Example of *St. Paul*; and since 'tis possible, 'tis that, I think, which he requires from us. And so we may the rather conclude from that Speech of his to King *Agrippa*, *I would to God that* Act. 26.
Thou, and all that hear me, were not Al- 29.
most, but Altogether, such as I am; full
as Religious, and quite every way as
Gracious.

Now, 'tis very reasonable to believe that *St. Paul* meant as much by his *As* in the other Texts, as by his *Altogether* in this; which imports that he would have us not only to imitate his Graces, but even to equal them too. And if this little Particle, *As*, doth imply an equality in other Texts, why not in this, which saith, *That we should honour the Son, as we honour the Father*; for, are we not able to pay the same honour to the one, which we do pay to the other? Or is the *Son* of God an unfit object to receive the same honour with his Father? he himself hath told us, *I and my Father are one*; and *St. Paul* saith, *He thought it no robbery to be equal with God*; and his Father himself calls him, *The Man which is my Fellow*. And if our
 Lord

Lord be indeed his *Father's Fellow*, equal to him in all the transcendent Excellencies of the Divine Nature, as certainly he is, why he should not have an equal share of *Honour*, let this trifling Scribler tell us, when he shall be at leisure to study this Point yet better.

Theophylact justly blames the *Arians*, for honouring the Son, *ὡς Κτίσμα*, as a Creature only, and saith that they do thereby, *ἀκμαζον τὴν Πατέρα*, dishonour the Father, because the same honour is due to both. Accordingly *St. Chrysostom*

Theoph. & Chryf. in Joan. c. 5. v. 33.

tells us, that the Son doth deserve and expect, *τὴν ἰσότητα*, an equality of honour; and for that he gives this reason, *Πάντα ὅσα ἔστιν ὁ πατήρ, ταῦτα ἔστι καὶ ὁ υἱός, ἡνυμνεῖς καὶ μένων ἐν τῷ πατρί* ὁ υἱός, whatsoever the Father is, Paternity and Filiation being excepted, the Son is the same.

And therefore saith *Maldonate*, *Eadem in utroque honoris ratio est, eadem natura, eadem potentia, eadem dignitas*, there is in both the same Foundation of honour,

the same Nature, Power, and Dignity. So thought *Athanasius*, who styles the whole Trinity, *ἰσότητος καὶ ὁμοούσιον*, equally honourable, as being consubstantial.

Athan. in disputat. adv. Arianum p. 147.

So then, according to the Doctrine of other Texts, and the judgment of learned Men, we may conclude, that contrary

trary to the Opinion of this Author, these words of Christ, *That all men should honour the Son, as they honour the Father,* do import and require an equality of honour; and if so, 'tis enough to prove that the Son is God.

S E C T. XVI.

THis Author having hitherto been very unhappy in arguing *argumentis*, proceeds to try his strength, *argumentis*. His own Arguments against the Deity of Christ being weak and easily baffled, he attempts an answer to other Men's Arguments for it. And here, with a great deal of confidence, he thus tells the World, *I will endeavour, as briefly as I can, to give them such reasonable answers, as shall make these truths* (so he calls his Heretical Opinions) *beyond exception.* Bravely resolved! but we may say, what was said of *Phaeton*, *magnis tamen excidit ausis*; for, how short he comes of his noble design, we shall easily discover in each particular.

1. The first Argument for our Lord's Divinity, to which this Respondent attempts an answer, is this, That Person,

to

to whom the Scriptures in several places do ascribe the *Character* and *Title* of God, is God. But our Lord is that Person, to whom the Scriptures do in several places ascribe the *Character* and *Title* of God. *Ergo*, Our Lord is God; for, were he not God indeed, the Scriptures would not so often call him so.

That the Scriptures do indeed once and again call him *God*, this Man doth not deny; nay, he confesseth, *That a God undoubtedly he is, and a mighty God too*: But how, and in what sense is he so? this Man answers that he is such a God, *According to the way of expression used in those antient times, in which those were called Gods, who either represented God's Person, or acted in his Name, and by his Authority*; but then he adds this bold assertion, *Christ is not God Almighty*. It seems that this Man allows Christ to be no more than a *Titular* God, an *Equivocal* God, a God in *Name*, but not by *Nature*, *i. e.* a God by *Office* only. But what a false pretence this is, will be evident from these three Considerations;

I. The Scriptures do ascribe to Christ not only the *bare Name* of God, but with such *Adjuncts*, as never did, never can belong to any Person, who was,

is,

is, or shall be, a God by Office only.

The Evangelical Prophet stiles our Lord, *the Mighty God*; St. Paul calls him, *Esa. 9. 6. the Great God*; St. John stiles him, *the Tit. 2. 13. True God*: Titles of which no God by *Job. 5. 20.* Office only was, or ever can be capable.

2. The Scriptures tell us, and so doth Experience too, that Gods by Office only must dye like other Men; and when they dye, their Office, and together with that, their Godship cealeth for ever.

But now, 'tis not so with our blessed Saviour; for, to him God the Father hath said, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever Heb. 1. 3. and ever.* His Authority and Godship shall never end.

3. The Scriptures tell us, that our Lord *was* and *will* be God, when there neither were, nor shall be, any Gods by Office only.

A God he was before the World began; for St. John and St. Paul expressly say, *By him all things were created; which Job. 1. 3. must needs suppose his own Pre-exi- Col. 1. 16. stence, Eternity, and Omnipotence*; and St. Paul as expressly stiles him, *God blef- Rom. 9. 5. sed for ever*; which supposeth the *duration* of his Godhead, when Gods by Office shall be no more. And this, I think, is enough to shew this Author's great mistake, and to convince him that those

those Texts which ascribe to our Lord, the *Name* and *Title* of God, do not mean that he is a God by *Office* only, but by *Nature*; and if so, he must needs be God Almighty.

2. The second Argument for the Divinity of Christ, to which this Man pretends to give an answer, is this, *If our Lord were not God as well as Man, he could not have been a fit Mediator betwixt God and Man.* But our Lord was a fit Mediator. *Ergo, He was God as well as Man.*

That our Lord, according to the *minor* Proposition, was indeed a *fit Mediator* betwixt God and Man, this Author doth not deny; but being loath to grant the Conclusion to the *major* Proposition, he thus replieth, *Christ being a Man perfectly righteous, was therefore fit to intercede between God and Sinners.*

But this Answer will not do; for no *mere* Man, how righteous soever, was *fit to undertake*, because not able to perform this great and difficult Work; for, here was an *Infinite Justice* to be satisfied, an *Infinite Guilt* to be removed, an *Infinite Happiness* to be procured, which things no *mere* Man could do. For had our Lord been a *Man*, a Creature, and no *more*, being made under the Law, he
had

had been obliged to obey all the Commands of God for *himself*; and certainly where all any Man's Acts of Obedience are *due* for himself, none can be *meritorious* for other Men. Nor was it possible for any *mere* Man to have satisfied the *Justice* of God for the sin of the whole World; the blood of Sheep and Lambs being innocent Creatures might as well have done it as the blood of a mere *righteous* Man. And therefore St. Paul tells us, *God hath purchased* A8. 30.
his Church with his own blood. 18. Indeed, God hath no blood; but the Man who had blood, was God too; and with such or none, could his Church be purchased. So then, should we allow that a mere righteous Man might have been a fit Mediatour of *Intercession*, which yet we do not grant; yet a fit Mediatour of *Satisfaction* he could not be. And since our case required both, no mere Man could have been sufficient for us. But more of this under another head.

3. The third Argument for the Divinity of Christ, to which this Man attempts an answer, is this, *That Person who is One with God the Father, is and must be God. But Christ is a Person who is One with God the Father. Ergo, Christ is and must be God.*

The

The Truth of the *minor* Proposition this Author dares not question, because our Lord himself hath plainly said, *I and my Father are one*; and St. John hath said, *There are three that bear record in Heaven, and these three are one*. These two Texts do so gall our Socinians, that they would willingly expunge and blot the latter quite out of the Canon; but since they can not do that, they endeavour to evacuate the force of both by a Distinction.

To that purpose this Man tells us, that this *Oneness*, which is said to be betwixt our Lord and his Father, is not *Natural* but *Moral*; an *Oneness* not of *Essence*, but of *Consent*, Love and Affection; and indeed such an *Oneness* as this, *μία βούλησις*, an *Identity of Will*, there is betwixt all the three Persons of the Godhead. But since this kind of *Unity* is common to *Saints* and *Angels*, we have reason to think, that it is another sort of *Unity*, an *Unity of Nature*, peculiar to these glorious Persons, which is intended in both these Texts.

And so was it understood by those *Jews*, who heard our Lord say, *I and my Father are one*: For why else did they immediately take up stones to kill him? For which they gave him this only
reason,

reason, *Because thou being a Man makest thy self God.* They took this Expression, *I and my Father are one*; to be an evidence, and so it is that our Lord owned a *natural* Unity betwixt himself and his Father, and thereby made himself *God*.

But when they who heard this Speech and knew the occasion of it, told our Lord, *Thou makest thy self God*; this Author plainly saith, *They belyed him*; But doth not this Man belye *them* in saying so? For can we think, that if the *Jews* had mistook our Saviour's meaning, he would not have explained himself and undeceived them, when by such a misapprehension of his meaning, his Life, before his time was come, was in so much danger? But our Lord was so far from excusing his own expression, or denying the meaning of it to be what the *Jews* supposed; that he rather *owned* and confirmed it by asserting himself to be the *Son* of God, which virtually contains the same truth, since he is not only a Son, but the *only begotten* Son, and consequently one in *Nature*, *Essence* and *Substance* with his Father.

And that the same *natural* Unity is intended in that other Text, which saith, *There are Three that bear record in Heaven;*

Heaven, and these Three are One, is very probable; for, whereas 'tis said of the three Witnesses, *that bear record on Earth, they agree in One*; 'tis said of the three Witnesses, *that bear record in Heaven, these Three are One*. Here seems to be a plain *Antithesis* betwixt these two Expressions, *They Are one*, and, *They Agree in one*; and if so, they cannot signify the same thing; but the one must import *primarily* an *Unity* of Nature, and consequently an *Unity* of Consent; but the other an *Unity* of Consent only.

That these Texts are thus to be understood, and no otherwise; I have already in the Twelfth Section of this Tract, produced the Authorities of many learned Men, with whom this Author is not worthy to be named; for if we shall put *them* and *him* into an equal balance, *their* Judgment will as much outweigh *his*, as *Bow-bell* or *Great Tom* of *Lincoln* or *Christ-Church* in *Oxford*, would outweigh the least *Bell* in any of this *Man's Clocks*.

SECT.

S E C T. XVII.

THE Fourth Argument for our Lord's Divinity, to which this learned Respondent thought fit to give some answer, is this, *That Person, who justly thought it no robbery to be equal with God, is, and needs must be God. But our blessed Saviour is that Person who justly thought it no robbery to be equal with God. Ergo, Our blessed Saviour is, and needs must be God.*

St. Paul expressly saith of Christ, *Being in the form of God; he thought it no robbery to be equal with God.* Now, if it were a robbery, our Lord did very ill to think it none; but dares this Man entertain one such blasphemous thought of Christ; but if indeed it were no robbery, then is Christ equal to God, which yet he could not be, if he were not God.

But to this Expression of St. Paul's, this Man opposeth that Speech of Christ, *My Father is greater than I;* from which Text he thus concludes, *If the Son be any ways equal to the Father, yet 'tis really but in some particulars, and in some things he may be equal; though*

in all things he cannot. So he. To which I answer,

1. 'Tis observable, that although St. Paul doth positively affirm of Christ, that, *he thought it no robbery to be equal with God*; yet this Man *suspects* at first, and doubts this equality; for thus he writes, *If the Son be any way equal to the Father.* This, *If*, is a note of distrust and diffidence; and plainly imports, that although our Lord thought himself to be equal to his Father, yet this Man is *jealous* and doubtful whether our Lord be so indeed, or not. But since this one Text is enough to confute all the pretences of this rank Socinian, we cannot wonder, that he should be so very unwilling to believe it true.

2. This Man upon second thoughts, being somewhat convinced by the force of this Text, but yet still very loath to confess the whole truth, doth yield at length, *That Christ may be equal to God in some things*, and this one he names, *In saving believers*; but then he adds, *This Power of Christ in doing this is not essential; but derived.*

But was this man in his right Wits when he wrote this so manifestly to contradict himself, and so quickly to over-

overthrow his own Concession? For, first he tells us, *That in some things Christ may be equal with God*; and as an instance of that Equality, he saith, *As God can save believers, so also this Christ can do, but by a derived Power only*. But is a derived Power equal to that, which is *Essential*? Is the Power of a Constable equal to that of his *King*, by whose Commission he acts? Doth such a derived Power at all imply our Lord's Equality to his Father in saving Souls? If so, Why may not *St. Paul* be said to be equal with God; for we cannot doubt, but by a *derived Power*, and as an *Instrument*, he saved many?

And indeed, whosoever acts by a *derived Power*, acts but as an *Instrument*; and if that were our Lord's Case, as this Man pretends, then as there is no Equality betwixt an *Instrument* and the *Principal Agent*, so neither could there be that Equality betwixt our Lord and his Father in saving Believers, or in any thing else, which yet this Man first allows, and then contradicts by this assertion, 'Tis plain that he from whom Christ receives his Power, must in Power be superior to him. Now, if there be such a Superiority, there can be no Equality; for, tis an old Rule, *Par in parem non*

habet potestatem. And yet this *derived* Power of Christ in saving Souls, which must needs imply something of *Inferiority*, is the only Instance which this Man names of that *Equality*, which he alloweth to be betwixt our Lord and his Father, and thus doth he contradict himself.

3. But although this Author doth, though somewhat unwillingly, allow our Lord an *Equality* with his Father in *some* things, yet he makes bold to contract that allowance, and plainly tells the World, *That Christ cannot be equal to God in All things*, to which we answer thus ;

St. Paul giving us an Intimation, that Christ is *equal* with God, delivers it in *Terms Indefinite* ; and if an Indefinite Proposition, in *materia necessaria*, be equivalent to an *Universal* in other Cases, 'tis so in this. And how dares this Man *confine* and limit this equality of Christ with God, which St. Paul ascribes to him without *restriction* ?

For the truth is, if Christ be *equal* to God in *some* things ; nay, in any *one* thing as this Man grants ; he must in the same respect be equal to him in *All* things whatsoever, why our Lord was equal to his Father, St. Paul hath left

left us this account, *Being in the form of God he thought it no robbery to be equal with God.* Which Text imports that our Lord's *Equality* with his Father doth arise from his being in the *form of God*; i. e. from his *Divine Essence* and Godhead. Now although we according to our weak Capacity, do frame to our selves some *different Ideas* and divers apprehensions of the Divine Attributes, as if there were some *real distinction* between them, yet in truth there is none. For, say the Schools, *Quicquid est in Deo, est Deus*, whatsoever is in God, is God; his Attributes are not really distinguished from his Essence, and since that Essence is *Indivisible*, where there is any *one* of its Perfections, there must they *All* be.

And this was and is the Case of the Son of God, who is *equal* to his Father in *all* the Perfections of the Divine Nature; so he is, 1. In his *Eternity*; for he saith of himself, *I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last.* 2. In his *Omnipotence*; for St. John and St. Paul say, *By him all things were created.* 3. In his *Omnipresence*; for we learn from his own Mouth, that he was both in *Heaven* and in *Earth* at once. 4. In his *Wisdom*; for St. Paul saith, *In him are hid* Col. 2. 3.

all the Treasures of Wisdom, and if All, there can be nothing more.

Now if our Lord before his Incarnation being then as still he is, in the *form of God*, was in *all* these perfections, which are but the same thing with the *Divine Essence*, equal to his Father; that *Essence* being *Indivisible*, and uncapable of any thing *more or less*, he must be equal to him in *all* the rest. And how then dare this bold *Mechanick* say, *Christ cannot be equal to his Father in all things, though in some things he may*? One Instance he gives us wherein he *may* be equal; but he prudently names no Instance, wherein he *cannot* be so.

'Tis evident from these Texts, that the Son of God was *every way* equal to his Father before his Incarnation, and whilst he continued his *Being only in the form of God*. And although he lost nothing of that form, and that equality upon account thereof; yet when once by his Infinite Condescension, he had assumed into his own most Sacred Person another *inferiour Nature*, and *took upon him the form of a Servant*; then, and not till then, might he justly say, *My Father is greater than I*, which must needs be understood in relation to his *humanity*; for his perfect equality

to his Father, in his higher capacity, being unchangeable, then did, now doth, and for ever will remain; and such an equality must needs prove him God.

S E C T. XVIII.

THE fifth Argument for our Lords Divinity, which this man endeavours to overthrow, but never can, is this, *That Person, who created the world, is and must be God. But our Lord is that Person, who created the world, Ergo, our Lord is and needs must be God.*

The Major Proposition is so clearly grounded upon so many Texts, and carrieth in it so much evidence of natural Reason, that this Author did not think fit to offer one word against its Truth. But although the Minor Proposition be as expressly delivered in several Texts; yet, for fear of the Conclusion, he saw himself concerned to elude those Texts, and pretend somewhat in answer to them; and all, that he could invent, is only this, *All Scriptures, which affirm Christ to be the maker of all things, must be supposed to speak*
Figuratively.

Figuratively; but why so? He gives this doubty Reason for it. 'Tis self evident, that in a literal sense he could never be the maker of the world, whose Being did begin to be some thousands of years after the world was made; so disputes this mighty Sophister, but still upon false suppositions. For, he supposeth 1. That those Texts, which affirm Christ to be the maker of the World, are *Figurative*. 2. That our Lord had no *real existence* before his Incarnation; both which Conjectures are utterly false.

1. To suppose all those Texts, which represent our Lord as the great Creatour of the Universe, to be *Figurative*, is a silly dream, and a vain pretence, invented without any ground, only to elude the force of those Scriptures, because in their *literal* sense they do so evidently overthrow the *Socinian Hypothesis*.

Moses tells us, *In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth*, words *Gen. 1. 1.* literally understood by all Men. St. John, writing of the same matter, and designing thereby to prove our Lords *Divinity*, in imitation of the *Mosaick Style*, begins his Gospel, as Moses began his *Genesis*, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God, by him all things were made.* The Crea-

Creation of the World, which *Moses* more generally ascribes to God: *St. John* more particularly ascribes to the *Second Person*, whom he calls the *Word*, the proofs of whose *Godhead*, being even then denied by *Ebion*, was the great occasion and intent of his whole Gospel.

Now, let any Man give us a solid Reason, why there should be a *Figure* in these words of *St. John*, whereas there is none pretended in those words of *Moses*; I think, the only Reason, that can be given, is this; those words of *Moses* in their *literal* sense do not cross the Opinion of our *Socinians*, but these words of *St. John* *literally* understood, as indeed they ought to be, do utterly *Confound* it.

But since this Man hath found, as he seems to pretend, what none of the Antient Learned Interpreters had the good luck to find out before him, I mean, a *Figure* in every Text, wherein Christ is said to be the *maker of the World*, - he should have told us, what *Trope* or *Figure* it is, and by what name it is called. We may presume that he means a *Metaphor*, because he compares these Texts with those, wherein our Lord Stiles himself, a *Way*, a *Door*, a *Vine*, which, saith he, are *Figurative* or *Mysti-*

Mystical Expressions, in which one thing is said to signifie another, as the Old Creation to set forth the New.

So then, this Authors meaning must be this, that every Text, wherein Christ is said to be the *Maker of all things*, must be referred, not to the *Old Creation*, described by *Moses*; but to the *New Creation*, i. e. the *Reformation* of the World, and the great Change of Religion, the abolishing of the *Old Covenant*, the establishing of a new one with all its Consequences, introduced by Christ, and the *Oeconomy* of his Gospel.

This being our Authors undoubted meaning, this consequence must inevitably follow; namely, that if we can find any Texts, wherein Christ is said to be the *Maker of such things*, and *such persons*, as were no way concerned in the *New Creation*; then must such Texts be understood of the *Old one*; and that our Lord, being the *Author* of it, must needs be the Omnipotent and eternal God.

And such is that Text, which the *Apostle* borrows from the *Psalmist*, and most evidently applieth to our blessed
Heb. i. 10. Saviour, *Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the Earth, and the*

the Heavens are the work of thy hands. Certainly this, laying the foundation of the Earth and the Heavens, at least, This Earth and these Heavens, themselves cannot be thought Terms Metaphorical; and what were they concerned in the new Creation?

But there is yet another Text, more full than this, where St. Paul speaks thus of Christ; *By him were all things* Col. 1. 16. *created, that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, Visible and Invisible, whether they be Thrones, or Dominations, or Principalities, or Powers, All things were Created by him: but how can that be, saith our Socinian? How can he be the Creatour, who first began to be so many years after the Creation? But will not this Man believe St. Paul, who answers* Col. 1. 17. *this objection, and saith of Christ, He is before all things, i. e. in point of Time and Pre-existence, as well as in point of Dignity and Pre-eminence.*

Now, hath our Socinian Author the Face to pretend that this Text is *Metaphorical*, and must be interpreted of the *New Creation*? If so, let him tell us, how those invisible *Spirits*, which are in Heaven above, and are here reckoned as our *Lord's Creatures*, did stand in need of, and were interested in, and advantaged

vantaged by, this *New* Creation; but if these words, according to the general persuasion of the most judicious Expositours, are to be understood in a *literal* sense; then are they an invincible Argument that our Lord was indeed the Author of the *first* Creation, and his being so is an infallible evidence of his *Godhead*.

But here this Author seems to give us an intimation, that he reckons these and the like Texts, which cannot be referred to the *New* Creation, but prove our Lord to be the Author of the *Old* one, among those difficult passages, of which St. Peter saith, *They are hard to be understood*. To which, I answer, 'tis indeed very hard to understand these Texts, and I think impossible to make any tolerable sense of them, in a *Metaphorical*, *Improper* and *Socinian* Construction; but if they be interpreted, as indeed they ought to be, in a *literal* sense, and according to the usual signification of their Terms, there are but few Texts more *easy*, obvious, and Intelligible. But our *Socinians* are highly concerned to strain and force these Texts to an *unnatural* sense, because, being rightly understood, they utterly *destroy* their *Heretical Hypothesis*,

2 Pet. 3:
16.

thesis, and undeniably prove, that Christ is God most high.

S E C T. XIX.

THE next thing, which this *Soci-
nian* Trifler attempts, is this; namely, to disprove the Union of the Divine and Humane Natures in the Person of Christ; and, to that end, he argueth to this effect: *That Person, who died as a Man, could not also be God. But our Lord died as a Man, Ergo, He could not also be God.*

This Minor Proposition being granted true, to confirm the Major, and so to secure the Conclusion, he gives this Reason; *A person, constituted of two such Natures, could never have died according to his Humane Nature, but why not? His Reason is this; One capacity must needs have supplied the defects of the other, especially the stronger of the weaker; he means, that if Christ had been God, as well as Man, his Divinity must have supplied the defects of his Humanity, and not to have permitted that to remain either Ignorant or Mortal: To which I answer, as to each Particular:*

1. There

1. There was no necessity that our Lord's *Divinity* should so far supply the defects of *Humane* Nature, as to render that *Omniscient*, had it been capable of being so.

The truth is, since *Omniscience* is one of those Infinite Perfections, which are no where to be found, but in *God* alone; the want of it must not be thought or blamed as an *Imperfection* in the Nature of *Man*. what *St. Paul* saith of himself, is true of the best of Men; *We know but in part*: That's the case of the most improved and enlightned Understanding here below, but how will it be with us above? *Aquinas* propounds this Question: *Utrum videntes Deum per Essentiam Omnia in Deo videant*? To which he answers thus in the negative; *Intellectus Creatus videndo Essentiam Divinam in ea non videt omnia*; when we shall see *God*, as he is, we shall not see all things in him, because our created and limited Understandings are in no capacity to comprehend an *Infinite* being.

Aquin.
Par. 1. qu.
12. Art. 8.

And this was our blessed Saviour's own case; for, as he was *Man*, he increased in Wisdom by degrees, as other Men do; yet at a far higher rate, and far greater measures, yet not so as to become *Omniscient*; for the Particular day

day and hour of the last Judgment was concealed from his Humane Soul, nor was there any need that it should be revealed to him, as Man; because it was no part of that Doctrine, wherein he was to instruct the World.

It was enough that Christ, as *Man*, was furnish'd with so much knowledg, as enabled him to reveal the whole will of God, to interpret the Moral Law, to instruct his Church, to solve all doubts, to confute all Errors, and to understand the very Hearts and Thoughts of Men. And since he had such a knowledg, as was sufficient for the discharge of that great Work, and those high Offices, which he had undertook, his *Humane* Nature could need no more. And if so, it was no more necessary that our Lords *Divinity* should render his Humane Nature *Omniscient*; than that it should render it *Omnipresent*; which had been *needless* and is *Impossible*.

2. There was no necessity that our Lord's *Divinity* should, as this Man contends, have so far supplied the defects of his *Humane* Nature, as to render that *Immortal*.

Nay, this was so far from being *necessary*, that it had been utterly *inconsistent* with that great End, for which

L

he

he came into the World, which was to save his Church, not only by his *Doctrine* and *Example*, but especially by his *death*. We do easily believe, that our Lord, by the power of his own Divinity, *could* have rendred his Humane Nature *Immortal*. He, who kept his own Body from starving forty days without any Food. He, who often preserved his own life from the assaults and outrages of Men, who were ready to stone him. He, who could have commanded a numerous Guard of Angels at his pleasure. He, who at last raised his own *dead* Body from the *Grave*, could have kept it from ever lying *there*; but when such thoughts were once suggested to him by one of his Disciples, who did it in much kindness too, how severely did our

Mat. 49.
26. 54.

Lord rebuke him, saying, *How then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled?* The preservation of his Humane Nature from Mortality was within the reach of his Divine Power, but it was utterly inconsistent with his Divine *pleasure*, and the most gracious design of his Incarnation.

3. Whereas this Author makes this demand; *How could he in Person be mortal*

mortal in one capacity, if he had been on the contrary immortal in another? I answer,

'Tis no new thing for a Person, constituted of two *different* Natures, to be *mortal in one Capacity*, and yet *immortal in another*. The Man, who makes this demand, is so himself; the *Body of every Man is mortal*, but the *Soul of no Man is so*. But as to Christ, if this Man supposeth, as he seems to do, that our Lord's *Person was mortal*, and died accordingly, he lieth under a very great mistake: for, that which *died upon the Cross*, was nothing else, but that, which he had *took upon him in the Virgin's Womb*; and that was, not the *Person*, but the *Nature of Man*.

When our Lord died, the *natural Union of his Humane Body and Soul* was broken; but the *Personal Union of the Divine and Humane Natures* was not dissolved; his *Spirit* indeed was separated from his *Flesh*, but neither his *Flesh* nor *Spirit* was parted from his *Divinity*. When first he became a *perfect Man*, the same moment he became a *God-man* too; and his two *Natures* being united, ἀνωγεινός, ἀδιάπτωτος,

as the Greek Fathers use to speak, their Union being inseparable, a *God-man* he continued even upon the *Cross*, in the *Grave*, yea and in *Hell* too, if he were, as many have thought, *locally* and *triumphantly* there.

True it is, our Lord upon the Cross
 Mat. 27. cried out thus, *My God, my God, why*
 46. *hast thou forsaken me?* But from thence we cannot infer that there was any *dissolution* of his two Natures; but there was *Subtractio Visionis*, his *Divinity* was pleased for a short space to *withdraw* its comfortable *influences*, and leave his *Humane* Nature to conflict with the Terrors of Death alone. And thus much may suffice for an Answer to this Man's impertinent Cavil against the Union of two Natures in the Person of Christ.

SECT.

S E C T. XX.

THE next thing, which this Man undertakes, is to prove this Proposition, *That Christ's being God of the Substance of his Father is an ungrounded Conceit.* 'Tis very strange that any Man in his Wits should dare call that a *groundless imagination*, which is so certain a *Truth*, so evident in Scripture, that it hath been owned and professed from Age to Age by the most pious and ablest *Divines* in the Catholick Church. Nor hath this mighty Disputant produced so much as one Argument to *disprove* our opinion, or *confirm* his own.

For, all that he saith, is impertinent and amounts to no more than this, *That our Lord, as born of a Virgin, was not the Son of God's Person, but of his Power only; not his natural Son, not begotten of his Father's Substance:* and pray, Sir, who denieth any thing of all this? Doth any *Trinitarian* affirm that our Lord, in respect of his *Incar-nation*, was so begotten? If not, why doth this Man tacitly charge us with

an Opinion, which none of us do own? The Faith of the Catholick Church about this [matter], is delivered in the *Nicene* and *Athanasian* Creeds. wherein 'tis said of our Lord, *That he is God of the Substance of his Father*; but how and when came he to be so? The Creeds answer, and the Scriptures confirm it, *That he was begotten before the Worlds*, and that was long before his Incarnation

And that our Lord was in *Actual* being before his *birth* from the *Virgin* is a Truth as sure, as the plain word of God can make it. St. John the Baptist speaks of him thus: *He, that cometh after me, is preferred before me; for he was before me.* Our Lord, as Man, was conceived and born some months after John, and is therefore said, to come after him, but notwithstanding that, St. John expressly saith, *He was before me, i. e. Natu Major, my Elder, more Antient than I: but how so?* Theophylact answers, *κατὰ τὴν οὐρανίαν ἐκ Πατρὸς ὁμινοῦν*; or, as another words it, *Non si humanam, sed si Divinam spectes generationem.* Our Lord was before St. John, not in regard of his *Humane* Nativity, but in respect of

Maldonat
in locum.

Theoph. &
Maldon.
in locum.

of his *Divine* and eternal Generation, as being the only, begotten Son of God. So thought St. Chrysostom, who saith, that these word, *He was before me*, are to be understood, *Παλαιός ὢν* ^{Chrysost. in locum.} *ὑπάρχων* *ωσαύτως*, of our Lords Existence before the World,

Nor indeed can these words be well interpreted any other way; for, the Baptist having said of Christ; *He is preferred before me*, gives this reason for it; *for he was before me*. 'Tis evident that the former Clause imports that our Lord was, as St. Chrysostom speaks, *ἀμωρότερος, ἐντιμότερος*, a Person of far more transcendent honour than John; and if the latter Clause should also imply our Lords supereminent dignity far beyond that of John; than doth the Baptist prove, *idem per idem*, which yet must not be imagined. But if these words, *for he was before me*, be referred to our Lords pre-existence before John in point of Time, or rather Eternity, then do they contain a very good Reason of that, which he had affirmed in the former Clause: saying, *he is preferred before me*, *longè* ^{Clarius in locum.} *major agnoscendus est*. He must be acknowledged far Greater than I, *neque id*

injuriâ, not without very good Reason, for he was before me, *nempe verbum apud Deum*, as being that Substantial Word, which in the beginning was with God.

But if this Text will not satisfy our Socinian Author, that our Lord, as being before John, was in Actual existence before his Incarnation, which happened six months after the birth of John; yet methinks that speech of our blessed Saviour himself should thoroughly convince them; our Lord saith, *Joh. 8. 58. Before Abraham was, I am*, as if he had said, *I, who according to my Humane Nature am not fifty years old, according to my Divine Nature am Eternal*, and so, *Before Abraham*. And here our Socinians cannot pretend, as they do in the forenamed Text, that this word, *Before*, should import our Lord's Pre-eminence in point of dignity, rather than his Priority in point of being, signified by the word, *εἰμι*, *I am*, *Θεὸς ἔστιν ὁ Θεὸς ὑπερωπεία ἀπὸ τοῦ διηνεκῆς* *εἶναι ἔστιν ἀὰ σημερινή*, a Word most properly and peculiarly applied to God, as signifying the Eternity of his Being.

Theophyl.
in locum.

And

And for that very reason might our Lord very justly apply it to himself, and tell the Jews, *Before Abraham was, I am*; for, Solomon brings in our blessed Saviour, under the Title of *Wisdom*, speaking thus of himself, *I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the Earth was; before the Mountains were settled, I was brought forth; when he prepared the Heavens, I was there, &c.* Prov. 8. 23, 25. &c. Methinks 'tis impossible for our Socinians, who say that Christ had no being before his Incarnation, to escape the force of these Texts, unless they deny that our Lord, under the Name of *Wisdom*, is the *Person* therein concerned.

But that our blessed Saviour is indeed the *Person*, whose *Eternity* is here described by Solomon, is the general Opinion of the best Interpreters that I have met with, *Rem unam hac omnia confirmant, & eo spectant, ut Verbi Divini aternitatem demonstrent*; and again, *Authoritas Christi declaratur ex ejus aternitate, &c.* so one Expositor; and thus another, *De Christo Dei sapientia, & Dei virtute intelligitur locus, de quo certum est hoc caput & sequens tractare*; accordingly those words of *Wisdom, I was set up from everlasting*, are thus expounded by a whole

Cartw. & Baynus in locum.

a whole Assembly of our English Divines, Christ was anointed King over the Church, by God's decree, before the world was; and again, those words, I was brought forth, they interpret thus, He was begotten by the Father from Eternity.

And indeed that Christ is here to be understood by the Name of Wisdom, is not the new Opinion of later Divines, but the Persuasion of the Antient Fathers, Ἀρχαίως ἡ σοφία Θεὸς Λόγος τυγχανει. 'Tis very fit to conceive that this Wisdom is God the Word; so Athanasius; and to the same purpose Great

Athanas. in
disputat.

adv. Ari-
um p. 121.

Basil. M.
adv. Eu-
nom. l. 4.
p. 105.

St Basil, Ἐπει-
τις τὸν Σολομῶνα
τῆς Σοφίας ἐκείνης εἰρηκέναι, ἧς ἐ-
ὁ Ἀπο-
στολὴ μέμνηται

One may say that Solomon spake of the same Wisdom that is mentioned by St. Paul, and that is Christ. Accordingly doth Gregory Nyssen apply to our blessed Saviour whatever Solomon here saith of Wisdom, and particularly the work of Creation, Λόγος τὴν ἀρχαίω-
ν τῆς Σοφίας δύναμιν ἐνέργησεν, παρ'
αὐτῷ γέγονεν τὰ πάντα. Solomon doth here treat of the Eternal Power and Efficacy of Wisdom; i. e. of Christ, by whom he saith, all things were made. St. Hierom expounding those words of Wisdom, The Lord possessed me in the beginning

Greg. Nyss.
adv. Eu-
nom. or. 2.
p. 78.

νιοῦ τῆς Σοφίας
δύναμιν ἐνέργησεν,
παρ' αὐτῷ γέγονεν
τὰ πάντα.

ginning of his ways, writes thus, *Vox Christi, qui vera est Dei sapientia, que ante omnem mundi creaturam ineffabiler ex Patre genita, &c.* This is the Voice of Christ, who is the true Wisdom of God, begotten by the Father after an unspeakable manner before the Creation of the World. Nay, that this Discourse of Solomon concerning Wisdom doth indeed relate to our blessed Saviour, was the Confession even of Arius himself; for, whereas the Septuagint by a mistake translated one word somewhat amiss, making Wisdom to say, the Lord, *ἐκός*, Created me; from this word Arius, in his Dispute with Athanasius, drew an Argument as from our Lord's own Mouth, to prove that he is a Creature; for in the Nicene Council he affirmed thus much, *Φημι τὸν υἱὸν λέγειν διὰ τῶ Σολομώντος, ὁ κός ἐκός με*, I affirm that, the Son of God said of himself by Solomon, *The Lord hath created me*; where Arius doth plainly confess that by Wisdom in this Discourse of Solomon's, our Lord is to be understood.

Hieron. in Prov. 8.

Athanas. in disput. adv. Ari. nm. p. 119.

And if that be granted, there is enough in the Context to prove that our Lord had a being before the Creation, and

and consequently that he could not then be a Creature; and if not a Creature, then must he be the Creator; for, *Omne Ens est aut Primum, aut à Primo*, every Being is either the *First*, or from the *First*; and since our Lord styles himself, *Alpha*, the *First*, he must be God Eternal, and if so, since he is the *only begotten Son of God*, he must be begotten of the *Substance* of his Father, for there was then *no Substance* besides.

S E C T. XXI.

THE Authority of our Saviour's *Miracles* is the next thing, which this Author cites and boldly calls in question, telling us, that they do not prove him, God, because he did them, as *Prophets* and *Apostles* did, not by a Power *inherent* in himself, but *derived* from God; and to prove that, he names several Texts, wherein 'tis said, that his Power was given him. To which we answer thus,

When our Lord was pleased to become a *Man*, it was requisite that his *Humane* Nature should be invested with

with so much power, as might enable him to work more and greater Miracles, than ever *Moses* and the *Prophets* did. His business was to put an End to the *Ceremonial Law*, which the *Jews* were very fond of; his business was to plant a *New Religion*, which both *Jews* and *Pagans* much opposed. Now, to justify his Commission from Heaven for the doing of this, and to prove himself the promised *Messias*, his working of such Miracles was very necessary. But forasmuch as such miraculous works do far transcend the very utmost abilities of Man, a *supernatural Power* was lent to our Lord's *humane Nature* from above by his *Father*, and by *himself* too. For, as in our *natural Actions* the Hand of Man, and all other bodily Members, do act by that vigour, which they derive from the Soul, to which they are united; even so in our Lord's *supernatural Actions* did his Humanity act by that Power, which his *Manhood* derived from his own *Godhead*, the fulness whereof, as *St. Paul* saith, *dwelt in him bodily*.

Col. 2. 9.

'Tis evident that our Lord had Power enough to work Miracles long *before* his Incarnation; for the greatest Miracle,

racle, that was ever wrought, was the *Creation* of the World; 'tis an Act of Omnipotence to *raise* the dead, and yet that is but to *restore* something out of something; but an Act of *Creation*; *productio entis ex non ente*, the producing of something out of nothing, which is a kind of *reconciling Contradictions*, is a greater Act of Power than any mere Act of *Restitution*. Now this Work of Creation, of all Wonders the greatest, do the Scriptures frequently and plainly ascribe to our blessed Saviour; we are there told again and again, *By him were all things made*; and if by him, then by his *own* Power too; for, 'tis the constant Doctrine of the Schools, that a *creating* Power is so peculiar to the Godhead, that it can never be communicated to any *Creature*; so that if our Lord created the World, as most certainly he did, he must needs do it, as being God, and by a proper and *essential* Power of his; for to be invested with such a *borrowed* Power is beyond the capacity of all *created* Beings. And if our Lord by his *own* Power did create this glorious Fabrick of Heaven and Earth, we may justly believe, that by the same Power he did those easier Works,

Works, *heal the Sick, cast out Devils, and raise the Dead.* Wherefore when our Lord immediatly before his ascension, said, *All Power is given unto me.* Matt. 28. 18. It was the *Man* Christ, and as *Man* that spake it, and so must all such Texts be understood.

So think our *modern Criticks*, and so thought the *Primitive Fathers*, who were Men of Piety, Parts and a learned Education; an advantage whereby through the ordinary Assistance of the *Holy Spirit* they were enabled to understand the Scriptures far better than this *Mechanick Divine the Clock-maker*. *Theophylact* expounding these words of Christ, *All power is Given unto me both in Heaven and in Earth*, writes thus; Εἶπον μὴ εἰς Θεός καὶ δημιουργός τὴν ἐξουσίαν πάντων ἐγὼ ἢ πρὶν κατακαταβῆναι φύσει, καὶ δὲ πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν αὐτοκρατορίαν ἐλάβον ἐξουσίαν καὶ πάντων, ὥστε περιουσιάζειν ὑπὲρ Ἀγγέλων ἐν ἑρανῶ. ὅτι καὶ τῆς δοξαζέμενης ὑπὸ πάντων πνεύματων πάντων. i.e. as if our Lord had said, I, who of old had all power in my hand, as being *God*, and the *Creatour* of the universe; have now, as a *Man* lately condemned, but now exalted, received, through the Union of my two Natures, all Power, even to be
adored

adored by *Angels* in Heaven, and glorified by *Men* on Earth throughout all Nations.

St. *Chrysostom* interpreting that address of Christ to his Father, *Thou hast given him power over all flesh*, puts this question, *Chrys. in* Πότε τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἔλαβεν; *Joann. c.* πρὸς τὴν πλάσσει αὐτοὺς, ἢ μετὰ τὸ πλάσσει; *17 v. 2.* ἐκ εἶχεν ἐξουσίαν τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἑαυτοῦ; ἀλλ' ἐποίησε μὴ αὐτοὺς, ἐξουσίαν δὲ αὐτῶν ἐκ εἶχε μετὰ τὸ ποιῆσαι; Ἐμὴν φαίνεται πάντα αὐτοὺς ποιῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀνω χερσίν, Ἐτὸς μὴ καλῶν ὡς ἀμαρτάνοντας, τὰς δὲ τιμὰς ὡς κατὰ τὸν νόμον. Εἰτα τότε μὴ εἶχε, νῦν δὲ ἀπώλεσε, καὶ πάλιν ἔλαβε; καὶ ποῖος ἂν ταῦτα δαίμων ἐφ' ἐγξάτο; *i. e.* When did Christ receive this Power over all Men? Was it *before* he formed them, or *after* he had made them? Had he not then a Power over the works of his own hands? He it is, that did all in former Ages, punishing those that sinned, and rewarding those that did well; and if he had such a Power at first, Did he afterwards lose it, and then receive it again? Is there any Devil so impudent as to say any such thing? 'Tis evident from this expression that St. *Chrysostom* owned an *Omnipotent Power* inherent in our Lord long *before* his Incarnation.

True

True it is, our Lord's humane Nature had an extraordinary Power given unto it, partly as a necessary Qualification to fit him for his great Employment, to confirm his Commission, to recommend his Person and his Doctrine to the World; and after his Passion, as a just Reward of his Service and Sufferings. So speaks St. Paul, *He took* Phil. 2. 7. *upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.* Here's an Intimation of our Lord's Service and Sufferings in his humane Nature, but what's his Reward? The next words tell us, *Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name, which is above every name; δόξαν ὑπὲρ πάντων δόξαν, a Glory above all Glory, a Power above all Power; for St. Peter* Hom. 7. *tells us, Angels, and Authorities, and Powers are made subject to him.* 1 Pet. 3. 22.

All this Power our Lord received as Man; but if he had not a like Power before his Incarnation, then saith Great St. Basil, *Μείζων ἐγένετο μετὰ τὴν ἐνδυσεωσιν τοῦ ὡς τοῦ ἐνδυσεωπίνεως.* Basil. M. ad Enom. l. 4. p. 99. Our Lord became Greater after his Incar-

M

nation,

nation, than he was *before* it, *ὅτι πρὸ ἄνθρωπου*, which Conceit, saith he, would be very absurd indeed.

But notwithstanding all this, I think we should not gratify our *Socinians* in the least, nor at all prejudice the Doctrine of our Lord's Divinity, by granting that he did indeed *originally* receive all his Power from God the *Father*; for, in the same Moment, or rather the same Eternity, wherein God the Father did communicate to God the Son his own *entire Nature* and *Essence*, that Nature being *Indivisible*, he must of Necessity communicate to him *all* those Infinite *Perfections*, which are *Essential* to it, and inseparable from it, whereof *Omnipotence* is One.

So then, to say that our Lord wrought his Miracles in his *humane* Nature by the exercise of that Power, which he *originally* received from his *Father*, is no greater a Prejudice to his *Divinity*, than to say, that by an Act of eternal *Generation* he received his *Godhead* from him, for they were communicated to him both at once.

SECT.

S E C T. XXII.

THIS worthy Gentleman proceeds like a Confident Heretick, to answer an Argument as used by us, to prove the Possibility of three distinct Persons in the Godhead, and thus he is pleased to word it for us, *God is incomprehensible, and may, for ought we know, be that which yet we cannot painly understand him to be; namely, that he is Three in Person, though but One in Essence.*

But by this Man's favour, we do very plainly understand him so to be, as to the *truth* of the *Thing*; though as to the *manner* How we confess our Ignorance, nor do we presume curiously to enquire into it, much less saucily to determine of it. 'Tis ground enough for our Faith, that the Scriptures have evidently revealed it.

Now to this Argument of his own framing, this Disputant answers thus, *Though we cannot know what God is in every respect, yet at the same time we may certainly know what he is not; as*

1. *That he is not a Man.* 2. *That he*

is not mortal. 3. That he hath not a God above him. 4. That he hath not received any kind of Power from another. All which this Man imputes to our blessed Saviour as so many Evidences, that he is not God. To which I answer,

1. To his first Allegation, *That God is not a Man*, we thus reply; That in the *Abstract*, the *Deity* is not the *Humanity*; that the *Nature* of God is not the *Nature* of Man, we do easily grant, but notwithstanding this, in *concreto*, we believe that there may be, and have already proved, that there certainly is one Person, our blessed Redeemer, who by the *Union* of the *Divine* and *Humane* Nature, is both God and Man.

2. As to his second Allegation, *That God is not Mortal*, we easily grant its Truth, *Dij Immortales*, ἄδείκτοι, ἀίῳ ἔασις, were the known Characters of supposed Deities amongst the Heathens. But withal, our Lord was made a Man, that he might be mortal; that for the Pardon of sin he might have Blood to shed; for, saith the Apostle,

Heb. 9.22. *Without shedding of blood there's no remission.* Nor would the Blood of Bulls

or

or Goats, or any mere Man, have served the turn ; and for that reason, the Son of God was pleased to become a Man, that he might be in a Capacity to die, and actually die he did; and so as St. Paul saith, *God purchased his Church with his own Blood, i. e.* with the Blood of that Sacred Person, who was *God* as well as *Man*; Man he was, that he might have Blood; and God he was, that his Blood might be valuable.

3. To this Man's third Allegation, *That God hath not a God above him*, we answer by Concession; for, God is very justly stiled, *optimus, maximus*, as the *best*, so the *supreme* and highest of *Beings*. And such a Being is our blessed Saviour, who, being *in the form of God*, is one with his Father, *co-ordinate*, *co-eternal*, and *co-equal* with him in all the glorious Perfections of the God-head. But in regard of his *Humane* Nature, which is a finite Creature, he is *inferiour* to his Father; and in that Capacity alone must we understand that Speech of his, *My Father is greater than I.*

4. This Man's fourth Allegation is this, *That God hath not received any kind of Power from another*; to which we answer thus. The *first* Person in the Trinity received no Power from another, but the *second* did, and yet is *God* notwithstanding; for, God the *Father* communicating his eternal Power to his *Son*, did by the self same Act, communicate to him his own eternal *Godhead* too, from which his *Omnipotence* is inseparable. And that our Lord did at once, and that from *Eternity*, receive from his *Father* his *Divine Nature*, and his *Power* with it, is undeniably proved by our Lord's creating the World; a Work, saith *St. Paul*, which evidently proves *His Eternal Power* and *Godhead*, which are two *Divine Things* never to be disjoined.

Rom. i.
20.

5. Our Author's next Allegation is this, *We know certainly, that if the Divine Godhead did consist of three Persons, that then neither of the three Persons singly can be God*. So he.

Methinks this Person writes, as if he, or we, thought the *Divine Nature* to be *Divisible*, as if the *Father* had the *First* share, the *Son* the *Second*,
and

and the *Holy Ghost* the *Third*; as if there needed a *Club* or Contribution of their several shares to make up the *entire* *Godhead*. If this be not his *own* thoughts 'tis very far from being *ours*, and why then doth he say, *That none of the three Persons singly can be God*?

The Catholick Faith about this matter is well known to be this, *That the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God*. Each Person is perfect God; and yet it doth not follow, as this Man saith, *That they may be said to be three supreme Beings or Godheads*, because the Divine Essence being *Infinite* and *Indivisible*, subsisting in three Persons, is *numerically One* and the same. But,

6. This Author still proceeding with the same Confidence, tells us thus, *We know certainly, that if any of the three Persons, said to be in the Godhead, be God by himself, as we have proved God the Father undoubtedly is, than all the rest are superfluous and unnecessary as to the constitution of the Godhead*. So he.

Methinks this is such an high Degree of *Blasphemy*, as no good Man would be guilty of for all the World;

How dares a poor worm proclaim the eternal Son of God to be a *superfluous* Person? Is there no need of him, who is our only Saviour? And how dares a Clod of warm Clay to tell the World that he certainly knows the blessed Spirit of God, who is our Sanctifier, Comforter, and Guide, to be an *unnecessary Being*? What meant our Lord to command his Apostles to Baptize in the Name of the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, if this *Son*, and *Holy Ghost* be *needless Persons*? What meant St. John to tell us, *There are Three that bear record in Heaven*; if two of these *Three* stand but for *Ciphers*?

There can be no Assertion more false and Impudent than this, and yet this Man saith, *We certainly know it*; But how doth he know it, and that with so much certainty? In matters of Faith the infallible Word of God is the only ground of certainty; and if that be the ground of this Man's assurance, Why did he forbear to name particular Texts to prove it? But all his Proofs is drawn from his own fallible Understanding, and his Reason is this, *One Infinite, Almighty, and most Wise Person is as sufficient to all the purposes of a Godhead,*
as

as ten thousand Deities. To which we answer thus :

Were such an Argument urged in relation to Men, it would hold good ; for, suppose three Men alike invested with *equal* Power ; if any *one* of these three would surely and fully exercise this Power to all intents and purposes, and in all cases, which did require it, the other two might be spared. For, three Men, whose Nature is *finite*, and but *specifically* the same, are *separate* and divided persons ; and consequently their *power*, residing in *different* Subjects, though it be the self same in *kind* and degree, yet it may be different in its *Execution* ; for the *One* may act without the *other* ; and if any *one* of them effectually doth so, the other *Two* are superfluous.

But if we shall suppose a *Triumvirat*, three Men invested with equal Power, yet so that they all should stand obliged jointly to concur in every Act, that no *two* of them could do any thing without the consent of the *Third* ; upon this supposition, none of them were superfluous, not *One* of the *Three* could be spared,

Now,

Now, if it be lawful, *Parvis componere Magna*, I would say, that this fore-named Case doth somewhat resemble or illustrate that of the *Three Glorious Persons* in the *Godhead*, who are indeed distinct Subsistencies, but not *Divided*: their Essence is *one* and numerically the same; and from this unity of their Nature there ariseth, *μία βούλη, μία ἐνέργεια*, One Will, one Operation: they do, and by a Necessity arising from their own Nature, they needs must conspire in every Act, which relates to the Creation of the World, the Redemption of Man, the support and Government of the whole Universe. For although we do commonly attribute the Work of Creation to the Father, of Redemption to the Son, of Sanctification to the Spirit; yet this is not to be understood exclusively, as if every one of these Glorious Persons had not an hand in each of these Gracious Works.

No; the Rule is this, *Opera Trinitatis ad extra sunt Indivisa*. Those external Works of God, which respect his Creatures, are undivided; what one Person doth, all Three do; for the Unity of their Nature, the sameness of their Will, the Identity of their Power and all their
Essential

Essential Perfections cannot permit, that it should be otherwise. And for this reason alone our Lord told the Jews thus: *The Son can do nothing of himself*; Joh. 5. 19. but why not? Was it for want of Power? No, for he saith in the same Verse, *Whatsoever things the Father doth, these also doth the Son likewise*; and of that he gives us this particular instance, *As the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickneth them, even so the Son quickneth whom he will*. But why then did our Lord say, *The Son can do nothing of himself*? He means, nothing distinct from the Work of his Father; accordingly he tells us, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work*, by which Expression the Jews did rightly understand that he made himself equal with God, though neither they did, nor this Man doth, believe him to be so.

But that is the true Faith of the Christian Church; and since the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost* are most certainly one and the same God, they must have one Will, one Power, and one way of working; for in this glorious Trinity, as *Fulgentius* speaks, *Sic totum unum est, ut nihil ibi possit separari vel dividi*: All is so One, that nothing

*Fulgentius
us ac fide
Ortho-
doxa.*

thing there can be separated or divided. And for this Reason did our Lord say, *Whatsoever things the Father doth, these also doth the Son, and that,* Οὐτως, likewise, i. e. & ὡς ἦν πατὴρ ὁμοῖον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν θεόν οὐμονύαν. Not only for the likeness of the things, that are done, but in respect of the equality of their Power ; the Son doth not imitate the Father, but Cooperate and by the same Authority do the same Works with him.

Nor indeed can it possibly be otherwise; for our Lord hath said, *the Father is in me, and I in him.* But how is Christ in his Father? Ως τὸ ἀνάγλαςμα ἐν τῷ φωτὶ, as *Splendour* is in the *light*; so inseparably are the *Father* and the *Son* United, that they can never be divided in *Essence*, *Will*, or *Operation*, and how then can either of them be ever spared?

It's true, were there but *one* Person truly God, an Infinite, Almighty, and most wise Being, were it really so; we should allow, that *one* Person so qualified with these and all other Divine perfections would be, as this Man saith, *as sufficient to all the purposes of the God.*

Gregorius
Naz. Or-
36.

Joh. 10. 38.
Atban.
adv. Ar.
Or. 3.

Godhead, as ten thousand Deities. But since we are clearly taught by those *Divine Oracles*, which cannot fail us, and by such plain Texts, as cannot be otherwise understood, that there are more Persons than *One*, in whom the *Divine Nature* doth *Equally* subsist; their Essence, Will, Power, and all other their Essential Excellencies being for ever the *same*; we are persuaded that they all do *voluntarily*, and yet *Necessarily* too, Conspire in all Acts of Power, Wisdom, and Goodness; so that none of them can be Superfluous; and since the Deity is *Indivisible*, we can no more spare any *One*, than *All*. The Father cannot be without the Son; the Son cannot be without the Father, nor the Holy Ghost without both, nor the Church without all Three. To conclude this Paragraph, every Person, who is truly God, is *Ens necessarium*, a necessary Being; and consequently the Son and Holy Ghost being truly God cannot be superfluous, and why then doth this Man pretend that he *certainly* knoweth them both to be so?

S E C T. XXIII.

THIS Author, proceeding without any Method, comes now to answer another Argument used to prove our Saviour's Godhead, and this it is, as he tells us in Effect, though not in Form; *That Person, who came down from Heaven, who came forth from the Father, and who ascended up where he was before, is and must be God, for an Angel he was not. But our Lord did all this, and was no Angel. Ergo, He is and must be God.*

To this our Respondent answers thus, *This Argument proves not that, for which it is intended, but why not? His Reason is this, 'Tis plainly inferred from other Scriptures, that Christ, some time before he was sent to declare the Glad Tidings of the Gospel, was assumed or taken up from the Earth into his Father's more Immediate Presence, there to be instructed in the Mind and Will of God, and to be invested with that great Dignity and Power of being a Prince and a Saviour, So he.*

But

But all this is, *Gratis dictum*. 'Tis affirmed without any sufficient proof, without any fair *Probability*; nay, not only without any pertinent and solid Reasons to confirm it, but against several clear Texts, which do confute it. For,

I. Our Evangelists have left us an Intimation, that our Lord in his Minority was bred up under the Wing and Government of his supposed Father and real Mother; nor do we read that they ever missed him more than Once; and then the Text saith, *The Child Jesus tarried behind them in Jerusalem*: there his Parents found him, and from thence, *He went down with them to Nazareth, and was subject to them*; and as some think, he learnt and practised his Fathers Trade, whether it were that of a Carpenter, or some other useful Artifice, whom the Greek Word, *Τεχνων*, and the Latin, *Faber*, may possibly import and signify. And if this be so, 'tis not very consistent with this pretended assumption of his Humane Nature into Heaven during his minority, whilst he conversed with his Earthly Parents here below; and that he did, if judicious Men are

Luke 2. 43.

Ver. 51.

Ita sentiunt Erasmus, Dru- sius, Grotius, in Marci, c. 6. v. 3. Et Mat. 33.

55.

are not much mistaken, till he was thirty years old.

2. As it is very improbable that our blessed Saviour was taken up into Heaven during the time of his *Minority*; so have we no ground to believe that he was so taken up at any time after his *Baptism* and before his *Resurrection*.

Mar. 1.
12.

When he was Baptized, St. Mark tells us, *Immediately the spirit driveth him into the wilderness, and there he was forty days tempted of Satan*; from thence he returned into *Galilee*, dwelt at *Capernaum*, called his Apostles, and went about Preaching and Working Miracles. 'Tis an unanswerable Prejudice against this pretended assumption of Christ into Heaven, that we have not the least intimation of it left us by any one of the Evangelists, who have Recorded the whole Story of his life, and several passages therein, far less considerable than this Would have been, had there been any such thing indeed.

Luke. 1.3.

St. Luke tells his Friend *Theophilus* thus, *It seemed good to me, having had perfect understanding of things from the very first, to write unto thee in Order,*
and

and so again, *The former Treatise have* ^{AR. I. 1. 2.}
I made of all, that Jesus began both to
do and teach, until the day, in which
he was taken up. Now, since this E-
 vangelist did so perfectly know, and
 was so very careful to Pen the whole
 Life of Christ from his Conception
 to his Ascension, can we imagine,
 that he would have omitted a Pas-
 sage so very material and remarkable
 as this?

'Tis indeed a known Rule and a
 true one, *A non scripto ad non factum*
non valet consequentia: we cannot cer-
 tainly say that this or that was ne-
 ver done, because it is not written.
 But, on the other hand, since this pre-
 tended Assumption is no where Re-
 corded, we have at least as much Rea-
 son to deny it, as any Man hath to af-
 firm it. For,

3. The Reasons, which this Man
 produceth to prove this pretended As-
 sumption of Christ into Heaven, are
 Two; and they are both very weak,
 frivolous, and inconsiderable.

1. His first Reason is this, *Our Lord,*
saith he, was thus assumed into Heaven,
there to be instructed in the Mind and
Will of God.

N

But

But what need could there be of such an extraordinary course as this? Was not God able to reveal his whole pleasure to his Son some other way here below? Was ever any Prophet, or any Apostle, except St. Paul, took up to Heaven to receive Informations there? That God, who could and did,

Heb. 1. 1. *Πολλοῖς τρόποις*, By divers ways and manners, reveal his Divine Will to his Servants here on Earth, could and doubtless did the same thing to his Son too. Instead of taking him up to Heaven it was the good pleasure of God to send down his Holy Spirit from Heaven, and to give his Son that Spirit without stint or measure; and this was done immediately after his Baptism, that he might thereby be enabled to overcome the Devil, and be most rarely qualified to reveal his Father's whole Will and Pleasure to the World. And since our blessed Lord was sufficiently instructed in the mind of God by the descent of the Holy Ghost upon him, and that so early too; his own Ascent into Heaven, to learn his Lesson there, was altogether needless; and if so, then, upon this ground

ground, we have no reason to believe it.

2. The second Reason, which this Man offers to prove this pretended Assumption of Christ into Heaven, is this; *our Lord, saith he, was thus took up into Heaven; there to be invested with that great Dignity of being a Prince and a Saviour.*

'Tis certain that Christ was *born a Lord, a King, and a Saviour*; and if so, what need was there of a miraculous Providence to take him up into Heaven, that there he might be invested with those glorious Titles, which had already been ascribed unto him by *three wise Men, and a wiser Angel*, even when he was but newly dropt from the Womb? After the Attendance of Angels at his Nativity, the greatest manifestation of his Glory was at his *Transfiguration*, and that was upon a *Mount*, but not so high as Heaven. And as for his solemn *Inauguration* and full possession of his Kingdom; that was reserved for him till after his *Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension.*

Luke 24.
26.

Philip. 2.
8.

Acts 5.
30.

So run the Scriptures, Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his Glory? His highest advancement was to succeed his Passion; so intimates St. Paul, *He became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross, wherefore God hath highly exalted him*: But when did God thus exalt him? St. Peter tells us, *The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, and hanged on a Tree; him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour*: To this great Honour he was not solemnly advanced till after his Resurrection. For although he had the Title of a King and a Saviour even from his Birth; yet till he had subdued all Enemies, Sin, Death, and Hell, he had no splendid Coronation. And if so, to what purpose should our Lord beforehand be took up into Heaven? Was it to have the Title of a Prince and Saviour given him? No, that was sent down to him by a glorious Angel here below; was it then that he might be fully invested with his Royal Dignity, and crowned as a King? No, that work was reserved for his Resurrection,

rection, and that *Ascension* of his, which followed it.

So then, Since both the Reasons which this Man produceth in favour of this pretended Assumption of Christ into Heaven, either to be there instructed in the Mind and Will of God, or to be there invested with that Great Dignity of being a Prince and a Saviour, are so improbable, infirm, and insignificant, we have no ground to believe it. And the rather because,

4. The Texts, which this Man cites to countenance this pretended Assumption of Christ into Heaven before his entrance upon his Publick Ministry, are either grossly misunderstood, or wilfully perverted, strained, and racked by him.

1. The first Text, which this Man cites in favour of this pretended Assumption, is that of the Prophet Daniel, *I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came to the Antient of days, and they brought him before him, and there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, and nations, and languages,*

Dan. 7.
13.

N 3

should

should serve him. So this Authour transcribes it, and tells us that to this pretended *Assumption* of Christ into Heaven before his publick preaching, this *vision* of *Daniel* doth plainly allude. To which I answer thus,

That there are many difficulties in this Prophecy of *Daniel* is the general Opinion of very judicious Men.

Cornel. à Cateris Prophetis antecellit obscuritate & Lap. in præstantia; So one, and to the same purpose thus another, *Videntur in hoc vo-*
Dan. *Pererius lumine due res plus quam in aliorum*
in Præfat. *Prophetarum libris eminere, doctrina ob-*

scuritas & præstantia. The Prophecy of *Daniel* is more eminent than other Prophecies for two things, the excellence of it's *Doctrine*, and it's *Obscurity*. So dark and enigmatical is this Book, that to understand several passages in it, we are told by a very learned Interpreter, *Multiplex Historia est necessaria*, there is a necessity of great knowledg in the *Histories* of former Ages.

Hieronymus in Præfat. ad Dan.

But although this Prophecy of *Daniel* hath seemed so very *abstruse* and difficult to many Learned Men, yet to this *Seraphical Divine* the
Clock-

~~Clock-maker~~ it seems but obvious, easie, and very Intelligible; for if not, why doth he tell us with so much assurance, that to this Assumption of Christ in to Heaven this Vision of *Daniel* doth plainly allude? Methinks he determines this doubtful matter as *Magisterially*, as if he sat in the *Roman Chair*, and were become the *Infalible Judge* of Controversies; nay, he writes as *Dogmatically*, as if he understood *Daniel's* Vision far better, not only than all our *Criticks* and *Commentators*; but even than the *Prophet* himself, who saw and wrote it. For some *Divine Revelations* this *Prophet* had, which yet he did not comprehend; so doth he himself ingenuously confess, *I heard, but I understood not*, and when his own Curiosity tempted him to inquire after the meaning of them, the answer, which he received, was this, *Go thy way, Daniel, for the words are closed up and sealed*. It's true, 'tis afterwards said, *the wise shall understand*, and very probably this Author may be guilty of so much modesty, as to reckon himself in the number of those *Wise ones*.

*Dan. 12.
8, 9.*

But, In the mean time, this Man cannot acquit himself from the crime of *dissimulation* in dealing with this Text; as the Devil dealt with another; he *leaves out that*, which he might easily foresee would make *against* him and his Interpretation. For the Text in truth runs thus, *Behold, one, like the Son of Man, came with the clouds of Heaven, &c.* These words, *came with the clouds of Heaven*, this Man doth wholly leave out, and there was a great deal of Policy in it; for these words, are a Key to open the meaning of this Vision, and to let us see the Letter to what it may refer.

I have not met with any Interpreters, except *Grotius* only, but they do all with one consent refer this Vision to our blessed Saviour, who is here Prophetically said to be, *One like the Son of Man*, a Title, whereby he afterward was pleased very often to stile himself. And because this *Son of Man* is here said, *To come with the clouds of Heaven*, several Interpreters have thought that this Vision refers to our Lord's coming to Judgment, of which

which St. John saith, Behold he cometh Apoc. 1. 7.
with Clouds.

Of this Opinion was Vatablus, the
Text saith, One like the Son of Man
came, But whether did he come? Ad
Judicium, he came to Judgment; so he.
And thus Munster and Clarius, Signa-
tur hic adventus Christi ad Judicium;
The thing intended in this Vision is
the coming of Christ to Judgment; so
they. Of the same mind was Tertullian,
who mentioning this Vision, writes
thus, *Christus ipsi Danieli revelatus, di-* *Text. ade.*
recto filius hominis, veniens cum celi nu- *Marcion.*
bis Judex; Christ was revealed to *l. 40. c. 10.*
Daniel directly as the Son of Man,
coming with the Clouds of Heaven as
the Judge of the World.

Now, were it not an Act of too
great presumption in me to interpose
my slender Judgment, and to declare
my own dissent from the Authorities
of such great and Learned Men, I
would say that there are two things
in the Text, which seem to obviate
their Interpretation of this Vision, and
its reference to the Day of Judgment.
For, 1. Our Lord is here said, To come
to the Antient of Days, and to be
brought

brought before him; whereas at the Day of Judgment he will be sent down from the Antient of Days, for he is already with him. Again, 'tis here said, *There was given him Dominion, and Glory, and a Kingdom, but that's already done, and long before the Day of Judgment.* Once more, 'tis here said, *That all People, and Nations, and Languages should serve him.* But that Service here on *Earth*, which, I think, this Text intends at the Day of Judgment will be over.

But that this Vision should rather point at our Lord's *Ascension* after his Resurrection seems to me far more probable; for the *Circumstances* of this Vision, as the Prophet doth here relate them, are very agreeable to the *Circumstances* of our Lord's *Ascension*, as our *Evangelists* have described them; the Prophet saith, *One, like the Son of Man, came to the Antient of Days, i. e. to God the Father; and in the Evangelist, when our Lord was near to his Ascension, he said, I leave the world and go to the Father.* The Prophet saith, *He came with the Clouds of Heaven; accordingly at our Lord's Ascension,*

Joh. 16.
28.

sion, the Evangelist saith, *A Cloud received him.* The Prophet saith, *They brought him before him.* But who were *They* who did so? 'Tis answered, *An-* Act. 1. 9.
geli stipantes, the Angels that were about him; accordingly the Evangelist tells us, that at our Lord's *Ascension,* the Angels attended him, and no doubt waited on him into his Father's more immediate Presence. The Prophet here saith, *There was given unto him Dominion, and Glory, and a Kingdom;* accordingly our Lord immediately before his *Ascension,* *All Power* Mar. 28.
is given unto me both in Heaven and 18.
in Earth; and immediately after his *Ascension,* the Evangelist tells us, *He sat* Mar. 16.
down at the right hand of God; an Ex- 19.
pression of the very highest Glory.

Now, there being such an Agreement, in so many Circumstances, betwixt the *Prophets Vision* and the *Narrations* of our *Evangelists*; that this *Vision* should relate to our Lord's *Ascension* after his *Resurrection*, there is great Reason; but why it should refer to a *pretended Ascension* some years before his *Passion*, this Man gives no good reason at all, and yet confidently

dently asserts, *that it plainly doth so.*

2. The second Text which this Man doth miserably abuse, and would fain force to countenance this *pretended assumption* of Christ into Heaven, is that of the *Joh. 3. 13.* Evangelist, where our Lord saith, *No man hath ascended into Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven*; from which words this Man would infer, that our Lord some time or other in his *humane Nature* had been *already* took up into Heaven, and then was sent down again; *and this, saith he, is plain.*

But if this Man's Sense of this Text be indeed so *plain*, as he pretends, 'tis somewhat of wonder that none of the *antient Fathers*, nor none of our *later Criticks* whom I have consulted, should so understand it, which to me is a great prejudice against its Truth. Amongst the *Criticks* upon the New Testament, 'tis observed that *Erasmus* and *Grotius*, though no *Socinians*, do interpret some other Scriptures too much in favour of that ill Opinion; but as for the Text now under debate, neither *Erasmus* nor *Grotius* do interpret or apply it, as this Man doth, nor any way like it.

And

And yet our Clock-maker tells us, that from the words of our Saviour himself 'tis plain that he ascended up into Heaven before he came down to declare his Father's will to men; for our Lord said, *No man hath ascended into Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven;* from which words this Man argueth thus, *No man but Christ ever came down from thence, which he never could have done, had he not first ascended up thither.* Here we have a complication of falsehoods. *No man, saith he, but Christ, ever came down from Heaven:* But what thinks he of St. Paul? What thinks he of Moses and Elias at our Lord's Transfiguration? Again, this Author supposeth, that Christ as *Man* came down from Heaven, which yet he never did, nor ever will do in his humane Nature, till he come to judge the World, unless it were *Typically* in the *Manna*, of which he said, *I am the bread that Joh. 6.41. came down from Heaven.* Once more, this Man saith, *Our Lord could not come down from Heaven, had he not first ascended thither;* but this is a prodigious falsehood, for in Heaven he was already, and had been there even from its first Creation.

When

Gen. 11. 7.

When God said, *Let us go down and confound their Language.* To whom did he speak these words, if not to his Son? And will this Man say, that God the Father could never go down, unless he first went up? if not, How dares he say the same thing of God the Son?

Most certain it is, that our Lord in his *Humane Nature* hath never ascended into Heaven more than once; and as certain it is, that to this very Day he hath never thence so descended. Never had his *Humane Nature* been in Heaven, when he spake these words, *No man hath ascended into heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man who is in heaven.* But how so? When our Lord spake this, he was on *Earth*; And how then could he at the same time be in *Heaven* too? On *Earth* he was as *Man*; but being also *God*; at the same moment he was in *Heaven* too. And yet when he mentions his descending from thence, he might justly stile himself, *the Son of Man*, for indeed he was both.

And why, *the Son of Man*, is said to ascend so, and descend from Heaven, before

fore his, Passion; this is the account which is given us by the most Judi-

cious Writers. Τὸ νομιστὸν λέγουσιν δια-
τὴν τοῦ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ, ἑωσιν, κυριαρχῶν
ὡς περ τῶν φύσεων, ἑωσιν δὲ ἑ καὶ κληθεῖν,
so one; and thus another, Σαφῶς δια-
τίθειν ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶς ὁ Κύριος, τὴν Θεο-
τίαν αὐτοῦ ἑαυτοῦ and so a third, Ὁ υἱὸς
τοῦ αὐτοῦ λέγουσιν κατὰ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ,
ὡς υἱὸς αὐτοῦ τοῦ Περσῶν, ἑ καὶ ἡμῶς
κατοικῶν. To these I need add but

Greg. Na-
zianz. Or.
s. p. 740.
Athan. de
incarnat.
Verbi. p.
592..
Theoph. in
Joan. 3.
13.

one Authority more, and a full one it is; *Filius Dei manebat in Caelo; filius*
hominis ambulabat in terra; per unitatem
verò personæ, qua utraq; substantia unus
Christus est; & filius Dei manebat in
terra, & idem ipse filius hominis mane-
bat in Cælo. The sum of these Te-

Aug. cont.
Pelag. l. i.
c. 31. t. 7.
p. 146.

stimonies is this, namely, that since there are two natures united in our Saviour's Person, there doth thence arise, Κοινωνία καὶ ἰδιωμάτων. Such a

Communication of their respective Pro-
porties; that as Theophylact words it,
Τὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ αἰσώματα λέγουσιν ἑ
τῷ Λόγῳ, ὃ καὶ τὰ τοῦ Λόγου τοῦ αὐ-
τοῦ περὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ. Names and things
properly belonging to our Lord's Hu-
manity are ascribed to his Divinity;

Theophyl.
ubi suprâ.

and

Chrysoſt.
in Joan.
c. 3. v.
13.

and ſuch as are peculiar to his *Divinity* are attributed to his *Humanity*. Accordingly St. *Chryſoſtom* expounding this Text, wherein the Son of Man is ſaid to come down from Heaven, tells us, Ὅτιον ἀνθρώπου ὄντα ὅτα ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐγένετο, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλάττωτος καὶ οὐ τοῦ ὅλου σώματος ὡνόμασε νῦν καὶ ὃ τοῦτο ἔδος αὐτῆς πολλάκις μὴ ἀπὸ τῆς Θεότητος, πολλάκις δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος πρὸ πάντων καλεῖν. Our Lord did not here call his *Flesh* alone, *the Son of Man*, but from his inferiour Substance denominated his *whole* ſelf; for indeed it is very uſual with him to denominate his *whole Perſon* many time from his *Divine Nature*, and often from his *Humane* too. When he calls himſelf, *the only begotten Son of God*, which imports his *Divinity*, that doth not exclude his *Humanity*; and when he calls himſelf, *the Son of Man*, that doth not exclude his *Divinity*; for both theſe Titles juſtly belonging to him, he was pleaſed ſometimes to ſtile himſelf, his *entire Perſon*, ſometimes by the *one*, and ſometimes by the *other*.

So that from theſe Words of Chriſt,
No man hath aſcended up to Heaven, but
he

he, who came down from Heaven, even the Son of Man who is in Heaven; we can no more conclude, that our Lord in his *Humane* Nature was in Heaven, and descended thence before his *Pas-*
sion, than we can conclude, that when he spake these Words, he was both in Heaven and on Earth, at the same time, and in the same Nature, which is impossible to be imagined.

S E C T. XXIV.

THere is yet one Text more, which this Author cites, as if it gave some Countenance, though in Truth it yields none to his groundless Assertion, and this it is; Our Lord saith, *The Father that sent me, he gave me a John 12. commandment, what I should say, and what 49. I should speak; from which words this Man doth thus infer, That Christ was taken up into Heaven to be instructed in the Doctrine, which he was to publish to the world. And here, again he saith, This is plain.*

O

Rut

But is it not a strange Piece of Confidence that a Man who scarce brings one *probable* Argument, should count every thing which he saith, to be so plain and evident, as if it were all *demonstration*? The thing which this Man asserts, is this, *That Christ was took up into Heaven to be instructed in the Doctrine which he was to preach*: But how doth this Disputant prove it? His Argument is this, *The Father which sent me, gave me a commandment, what I should say*. But how doth it follow from hence, that Christ was took up into Heaven, there to receive his Father's Commands?

We are sure that God gave a Command to *Moses*, what he should both *speak* and *write*, and to that end *Moses* was indeed took up into a *Mount*, but not into *Heaven*; God also gave Commandments to the *Prophets*, what they should *speak* and *write*; and yet we do not find that any one of them was ever taken up into *Heaven* to receive their Instructions there. No, St. Peter tells us, *Holy Men spake, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*; and could not our *Lord*, to whom his Father gave the *Spirit* without measure, speak so too? Those

2 Pet. 1:
21.

Those Words of the Evangelical Prophet our Lord applied to himself, *The Lord hath anointed me to preach the Gospel.* This *Unction* imports his *Designation* and Commission for that great Office; but what enabled him to understand his Business, and fully to execute what he had undertaken? Was his *humane* Nature carried up to *Heaven*, there to learn those Sacred Lessons which he was to teach the World? Not a word of that; but the Text gives us another account full as sufficient and far more certain, and this it is; *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me*; and surely he, who had the *Holy Ghost* for his *Instructor*, so near him and always with him, had no need to be assumed into *Heaven* to learn any Lessons there.

It was the Promise of God relating to Gospel-times, and fulfilled upon our Lord's *Apostles* on the Day of *Pentecost*, *Act. 2.17.* *I will pour out of my spirit upon all flesh*; and by Vertue of this Effusion, 'tis said of these *Apostles*, *They spake the wonderful works of God, as the spirit gave them utterance.* Now, if the blessed Spirit, enable our Lord's *Apostles* to execute

cute their Commission, much rather may we believe that it enabled our Lord himself to execute his ; for as to the Apostles, the Promise of God was only this, *I will pour out of my Spirit*, ἀπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος, something of my Spirit, μέρος τινα, saith St. Chrysostom ; some few drops, some smaller proportion of my Spirit ; but as to our Lord, the Phrase *Matth. 3. 16.* is altered ; 'tis said, *The Spirit descended on him* ; and again, *God giveth him the Spirit* ; not of the Spirit, but as St. Chrys. *Joh. 3. 34.* in *sofom* speaks, Ὁλόκληρον πᾶσαν τὴν τῷ *Joan. c. 3. v. 34.* Πνεύματι ἐνέργειαν, the whole and entire Power and Efficacy of the Spirit. And since this blessed Spirit did thus descend upon our Lord, and that immediately after his Baptism, instructing his humane Understanding in the whole Will of God, which was to be revealed to the World ; our Lord could have no need to be took up into Heaven to receive any fresh Informations there.

So then, as those Texts, which say, *Lev. 8: 4.* *Moses did as the Lord commanded him*, are no Proofs that *Moses* was took up to Heaven to receive the Commands of God ; so this and the like Texts, where-
in

in our Lord saith, *Whatsoever I speak*, *John 12.*
even as the Father said unto me, so I^{50.}
speak, are of no force to prove that he
 was carried up to *Heaven* upon any like
 account.

But the Truth is, this pretended ex-
 altation of Christ to Heaven before he
 began to preach, was the foolish ima-
 gination, and the silly *Dream* of *Laelius*
Socinus, who magnified himself for this
 Invention, as if the Revelation of this
 supposed Secret had been a Token of
 God's peculiar Favour, an answer to
 his Petitions, and a reward of his De-
 votions. But were not our Lord's *Apo-*
stles and *Evangelists* as devout and pi-
 ous Persons, as this *Laelius* could pre-
 tend to be? Had they not a sure Pro-
 mise from Christ, that his Spirit *should* *John 16.*
guide them into all truth? Was not^{13.}
St. John, that beloved Disciple, *Philos-*
ophus, our Lord's *bosom* Friend; was
 not he as great a *Favourite* of Heaven
 as this *Socinus* could be? And were
 not those *Primitive Bishops, Saints* and
Martyrs, who died in and for the Faith
 of Christ, as worthy to be entrusted
 with this Secret, had there really been
 any such thing, as this *Enthusiast*, who

stands deservedly branded for an *Heretick* ? I am of Opinion, that this *Socinus* was full as much *deluded*, as our late *John Mason* ; the one vainly imagining that Christ was *come down from Heaven* ; the other, that he was *took up*, and both before the time was come.

S E C T. XXV.

THE next thing which this Man endeavours, but can never do, is to disprove the *Eternity* of Christ ; and truly considering his Principles for this attempt, though but a vain one, we cannot blame him. For the *Socinian* Opinion is chiefly grounded upon this *Hypothesis* or Supposition, that our Lord had no *real Being* before his Incarnation ; for, if he had, he must for unanswerable Reasons, have been from *Eternity*, and consequently must be *God*, which our *Socinians* deny.

Now, to disprove the *Eternity* of Christ, which this Man knew to be his grand Concern, he makes use of a double Argument drawn from our Lord's double

double Relation. 1. That to God, as his Father. 2. That to the Virgin, as his Mother.

1. And from our Lord's Relation to God as his Father, this Disputant frames his Argument thus ; *'Tis impossible for Christ to be Eternal ; for if God be his Father, then there was a time when the Son had not a Being ; for to be a Son, and to be equal in duration with his Eternal Father that begat him, is undoubtedly impossible : So thinks this Author.*

But when will Men cease to measure an *Infinite* and *Incomprehensible Being* by themselves ? When will they cease to charge those Divine *Mysteries*, though clearly revealed as to their truth, with *Contradictions* and *Impossibilities*, barely because the manner of them transcends the utmost reach of their own finite, shallow, and dark Understandings ? We know, that amongst Men no Son can be of equal Age with his own Father, because there is a natural *Impotence* which disables a Man to beget, and a Woman to conceive and bring forth a Son, till they themselves be grown up to some ma-

turity of strength, which requires several years ; so that there must needs be a considerable distance of time betwixt the *Father* and the *Son*. Besides, among Men the *begetting* of a Son is an Act that's *free* and voluntary ; 'tis at every Man's choice whether he will quite forbear such an Act, or *when* he will attempt it.

Thus stands the case with *Men*, but it is not so with *God* ; for, tell me, Dares any saucy Wretch charge the Almighty with that natural *Imperfection* and Impotence, that is found in Man ? What could hinder that God from begetting a Son out of his own Substance from all *Eternity*, who in *time* created the World out of nothing ? Nor doth such a begetting of such a Son import any necessity, that there should be so much as one *moment's* distance betwixt him and his Father ; For what good reason can be assigned, why God the *Father* might not beget his Son, *ὁν ὁμοῦν. in eodem puncto*, in the very first moment, if I may so speak, wherein he himself was, even from *Eternity* ?

We

We cannot conceive that the *Sun* in the Firmament, since it was a *Sun*, ever was one moment without its *light*; nor can we conceive that a *Fountain*, which alway overflows, should ever be without a *Stream*; and why may we not think that *God*, ever since he was *God*, never was one moment without his *Son*, who issueth from him as *naturally* and as *necessarily*, as *light* doth from the *Sun*, as a *stream* doth from a never failing *Spring*.

I have met with some, who, to prove the *Eternity* of the *World*, used this Argument; namely, that it issued not from an *Arbitrary Act* of *God's* free Pleasure, Choice, and Power, but from a *necessity* of his Nature; what these Men thought concerning the *World* in General, we have reason to believe is true concerning *Christ*, that he was, and is, and ever will be the *Son* of *God* by a *natural* and *necessary Generation*, i. e. by an entire Communication of the Divine Nature to him, which is an *Act* not *Transient*, but *Eternal*. And for this Reason the *Father* and the *Son* are,

οὐ γινώσκοντες

σύγχροτοι, Co-eval and Co-eternal. A thing, which this Man thinks impossible, barely because it cannot be so among Men.

2. The Second Argument, which this Man urgeth against the *Eternity* of Christ, he draws from our Lord's *Relation* to the Virgin his *Mother* and her Progenitors.

And here he minds us, that our Lord was of the Seed of *Abraham*, one of *David's* Posterity, and made of a *Woman*; and therefore could not be more *Antient* in time, than *Abraham*, and *David*, and the *Mother* that bare him. All which proves no more than this; namely, that our Lords *Humane* Nature, which he derived remotely from *Abraham* and *David*; and immediately from his Virgin *Mother*, was not *Eternal*; which we easily grant.

But notwithstanding this, we are plainly told, that Christ was *before Abraham*: nay, *before all things*: and again, *before the world was*; and do not these Texts undeniably prove the *Eternity* of his Existence? No, saith this *Socinian*; these Texts prove no more than

than this: namely, that Christ was before all things in the Foreordination, Decree, and Counsel of God, but not that he was so in *Æt*nal being and Pre-existence. And to confirm this, he cites the Testimony of St. Peter, who saith of Christ, *He verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times*; from whence this Man draws this worthy Inference, no foreordained being can be eternal, since he, that did ordain his being, must be before him of necessity: To which I thus reply:

In what capacity and respect our Lord was foreordained according to St. Peter's meaning, we must judg by the Contexture and Coherence of his discourse; where in the foregoing Verse having mentioned, *The precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish, and without spot*; he immediately adds these words, *who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world*. 'Tis very evident from the Connexion of this Verse with the former, that the Incarnation of Christ, that innocent Lamb of God, who was designed to Redeem the

the World by the shedding of his blood, is the *thing* here said to be *foreordained*; according to which sense he is elsewhere
Act. 2. 23. said, *To be delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, and*
Apo. 13. 8. to be, *the Lamb slain from the beginning of the world*: So that the only thing here intended by *St. Peter*, and said to be foreordained, was the *Incarnation* of *Christ* with all its consequences, and particularly that great one of his *Death* and *Passion*: and from hence no good Inference can be drawn against our Lord's *Eternity*; for this foreordination of his *Human Nature* and the Consequences of it can prove no more, than that his *Humanity*, being the thing *foreordained*, was of a later date than he who did foreordain it, and who can doubt it?

And whereas this Man would fain elude the force of that Text, where our Lord saith, *before Abraham was, I am*, and that of *St. Paul*, who saith of *Christ*, *He was before all things*, by telling us, that so he was in the *Foreordination*, *Decree*, and *Counsel* of
 God;

God; I answer, if that were all which our Lord and St. Paul meant by those Expressions, then did they say no more of Christ, than this Clock-maker, or any Man else, may say of himself; for before Abraham was in Actual being, nay, before any thing was created, every Man, as well as the Man Christ Jesus, was in God's foreordination, Decree, and Counsel. But when our Lord said, *Before Abraham was, I am*, and when St. Paul said, *He was before all things*; whether they meant no more in reference to our Lord, than what is common to all mankind, I leave to the Judgment of every Person, who hath not utterly abandoned his own reason; who is not *welded*, or rather quite *enslaved*, to an ill Opinion.

But this Author is not ashamed to intimate, that if the Sense of these Texts be not, as he interprets them, *They contradict both common understanding, and the greatest and plainest part of all the Bible*. This Intimation is very bold and very false; for, if the sense of these Texts, different from this Man's

Inter-

Interpretation, do indeed Contradict common understanding, how came so many Expositors, Men of incomparable Learning and acute Judgments, to Interpret these Texts, as we do?

Gregorius
Naz. de
laudibus
Athanas.

I remember that Gregory Nazianzene begins his *Panegyrick* in praise of Athanasius thus, Ἀθανασίου ἁγίων ἀρετῶν ἑμπύσματος, In commending Athanasius I must commend *Virtue* too; and for so saying he gives this Reason, Ὅτι πάντες ἐν αὐτῷ συλλαβὴν ἀρετῶν εἶχε, for he had all *Virtue* comprehended in him. But notwithstanding all his Excellencies, I know that our *Socinians* hate his Writings, and to render his *works* the less valuable, they slander his *Person*, and very undeservedly bespatter his *memory* what they can. But yet, I hope they will allow so famous an *Archbishop*, who shewed himself able to contest with the most learned and subtle *Hereticks* of his Age, to have been a person of something more than common understanding.

The question then is, how doth this Man of more than vulgar Reason Interpret those words of Christ, *Before*
Abra-

Abraham was, I am? How? In God's foreordination, and no otherwise? What thought *Athanasius*? Did he think another Interpretation of this Text to be contradictory to common Reason? No, what his Opinion was, we may judge by these words of his, *Διὰ τὸ ἔχειν, ὅτι ἀρχαῖος ἦν, τοῦ Πατρὸς αὐτῶν ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ τοῦ αἰῶνος δημιουργὸς ἔστι, &c.* i. e. 'Tis manifest, that our Lord's pre-existence before *Abraham*, is an evidence, that his Incarnation was not the beginning of his Being, but that he was for ever present with his Father, and the Maker of the Universe. It seems then that this great Man was thoroughly satisfied in his own judgment, that these words of Christ, *before Abraham was, I am*, are an infallible evidence of our Lord's Eternity.

*Athanas.
adversus
Arian.
Or. 3. p.*

423.

But because our *Socinians* are possessed with such a prejudice against the very name of *Athanasius*, as is enough to render his Authority insignificant to them; it will not be amiss to add the Testimonies of some other Interpreters, with whom these Men are not so much offended: That of *Theophylact* may be one

Theophyl.
in Joan.
8. 58.

one, who observes, that our Lord, mentioning *Abraham*, saith, *Before Abraham was*: this, *was*, is spoken of him, ὡς φθαρτῆ, as of one subject to corruption; but when our Lord spake of himself, he altered his expression, and did not say, *I was*, but, *I am*; and why so? *Theophylact* gives this Reason for it, αὐτῷ ἡ λείξις ἐπὶ Θεῷ κυρωμένη, ἀπὸ διηνεκῆς τῆ εἶναι ἐ ἀεὶ σημεῖον αἰδιόνητον θεοῦ ἐμφάνει; this Title, *I am*, which our Lord here assumes to himself, is peculiar to God, and signifieth the *Eternity* of the Divine Being.

Chrysost.
in Joan.
8. 58.

So thought *St. Chrysostom* too, for thus he writes, Ὡσαύτῃ ὁ Πατὴρ αὐτῷ ταύτῃ καὶ χρησάται τῇ λέξει τῇ, εἰμὶ, ἔγω ἐ αὐτός. As God the Father stiled himself by this Title, *I am*, so did our blessed Saviour too; and for his so doing *St. Chrysostom* gives us this Reason; Τῷ διηνεκῆς γὰρ εἶναι σημεῖον αὐτῷ λείξις, ὅπουτος ἀπὸ ἀλλοτρίων χρόνων. for this Title, *I am*, imports our Lords *Eternity*, free from all intervals and limits of Time.

Of

Of the same mind was that great Man St. *Austin*, who, descanting upon those words of Christ, *Abraham rejoiced to see my day*, the day of my *Incarnation*; tells us, *secundum hanc habet tempus, divinitas vero ejus omne tempus excedit, quia per illam universa facta sunt tempora*. Our Lord's Human Nature was subject to time, but his Divine Nature exceeds all time, for by it were all times made. Again, When our Lord said, *Before Abraham was, antequam fieret*, before he was made, *I am*; the same St. *Austin* expounds it thus, *Intellige fieret ad humanam naturam, sum vero ad Divinam pertinere substantiam*; the words, *was made*, import *Abraham's Human Nature*; but the word, *am*, imports our Lord's *Divine Substance*. And thus he goeth on, *Qui loquebatur, semen Abrahæ factus erat; & ut Abraham fieret, ante Abraham ipse erat*: Our Lord, who spake these words, was made the Seed of *Abraham*; and that *Abraham* might be made, our Lord in *Actual being* was before him.

And that these words must needs be thus understood, is evident from the context; for they are a direct answer to the *Jews* question: *Thou art*

Aug. adv.
Pelag. &
Celest. L. 2.
c. 47.
John 1. 36.

Aug. in
Joan. c. 8.
Tract. 43.
Tom. 9.
p. 76.

Hammondus in
Joan. 9. 58.

not yet 50 years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? Yes, saith Christ, before Abraham was, I am; as a very learned Divine of our own Church doth Paraphrase upon it. I have a being from all Eternity, and so before Abraham was born, and so might well have seen, and known him.

Maldonatus in eun.
locum.

To these Authorities I shall add but one Testimony more, which saith of Christ, *quamvis, ut homo erat, nondum 50 haberet annos, tamen esse præterea Deum, qui non solum ante Abraham, sed ante omnia etiam sæcula extitisset.* Though our Lord, as Man, was not yet 50 years old; yet, as being God also, he was, not only before Abraham, but before all Ages.

And now let this Socinian Scribler tell us, whether these forenamed Authors, who interpret this Text, as we do, judging it to be a plain evidence of our Lord's Eternity, were not Persons at least of common understanding; but if they were more than so, Men of excellent parts and accurate judgments; why is not this Man ashamed to say, that this Text, so understood, contradicts the common reason of Mankind? But I am of Opinion, that they, who interpret it another way, do want

want, either the common reason of Men,
or the common honesty of Christians.

But this Trifler stops not here, but
goeth on to tell us, that this Text;
being interpreted as an Evidence of
our Lord's *Actual* being before *Abra-*
ham, and of his *Eternity*, doth contra-
dict the greatest and plainest part of all
the Bible: So he.

'Tis commonly said, *Dolus latet in*
Universalibus: This Charge, being on-
ly in *General*, without some *particular*
Proofs signifies nothing. It was indeed
our Author's great Prudence not to in-
stance in any particular Passages of Ho-
ly Writ, because he can never prove,
that any *one* Text is contradicted by
our Interpretation of this. When
our Lord saith, *Before Abraham was, I*
am; We affirm, that this Text im-
ports our Lord's *Eternity*; that's our
Interpretation of it, nor do we know
any other Text that contradicts it;
but we do know several Texts, which
agree very fairly with it, and confirm
it. So doth that of *Solomon*, where
'tis generally supposed, that our ble-
sed Saviour, under the Title of *wisdom*,
speaks thus of himself, *I was set up*
from Everlasting; so undoubtedly doth
that of the Prophet, where the *Mes-*

Pro. 8. 2.
Mic. 5. 2.

has is said to be one, whose goings forth have been of old, from the days of Eternity; so doth that of the Psalmist, which the Apostle applieth to Christ:

Heb. 1. 10. Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the Earth, &c. So

John 1. 3. All things were made by him, &c. and so doth that of

Col. 1. 16. By him were all things created, that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, &c. All these Scriptures do undeniably prove our Lord's Eternity, either

in express Terms, or by necessary consequences; and since they do so, they do fairly correspond and suit with our Interpretation of these words of Christ, *Before Abraham was, I am*, my Being is Eternal.

Now, to retort this Objection, and to speak a little, *ad Hominem*, to the Man, that raised it; St. John tells us,

Joh. 1. 1. In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God; and certainly if our Lord was

God in the beginning, he is so still, and will be so to the end. St. Thomas, who knew him well, called him, *My*

Ra. 9. 5. Lord, and my God, and his Master did not disown either of these two Titles.

St. Paul stiles him, *God blessed for ever.* St. John saith of him, *This is the true God;*

God;

God; and as for his Heavenly Father,
To the Son, he saith, thy Throne, O Heb. 1. 3.
God, is for ever and ever. These Texts
do assert the Divinity of Christ in as
plain words, as can well be utter'd;
and yet this Man, in defiance of these
and other Divine Testimonies, which
can never be understood in any other
tolerable sense, dares lay down this as
an undoubted Conclusion; *That Christ*
is not truly God: who then contradicts the
Scriptures, we, or he?

SECT. XXVI.

THE Satisfaction of Christ is the
next thing, which this Author
pleads against; nor can we wonder
that he, who denyeth our Lord's Di-
vinity, should also deny his Satisfaction,
which wholly depends upon it; for,
thus we argue, *If Christ had not been*
God, the sacrifice, which he offered for
sinner, would not have been of that in-
finite worth, which was necessary to sa-
tisfie the infinite Justice of an offended
God.

Doubtless this Argument can never
be overthrown; nor can those Texts,
P 3 upon

upon which it is bottomed, ever be fairly answered: such is the persuasion of our most judicious, pious, and learned *Divines*; and yet this *illiterate Mechanick* makes bold to attack it, and tells the World, *The Holy Scriptures do not anywhere declare this Doctrine.*

How? no where? neither in *express Terms*, nor in direct and *necessary consequences*? certainly he, who proclaims such a notorious falshood, must be supposed to read the Scriptures, either with a *purblind eye*, or a *distempered head*, clouded with *ignorance*, or intoxicated and drunk with *Prejudice*.

- Heb. 9. 12.* The Scripture tells us, *Christ hath obtained Eternal Redemption for us*: But how did he do it? without any satisfaction, or with one? The very notion of a *Redemption* imports, what St. Paul doth plainly exprels; *ye, are bought with a Price*, and a very great one too; so saith the same Apostle, *God hath purchased his Church with his own blood*; and 'tis said again by our Lord himself, *Mat. 20. 28* *The Son of man came to give his life, Αὐτοῦ, a price of Redemption, or, Ransom for many.*

To all these and the like Texts, which import our Lord's *satisfaction*, this Man was not able to answer any thing, save only

only to say, *These are but improper expressions*; and why might he not as well have said, we are but *improperly redeemed, improperly saved*; Putative, as those old Hereticks Cerdon and Marcion affirmed, *in shew*, not at all; for, if the Divine Justice be not properly and completely satisfied, no Flesh can be saved.

But, as to disprove the *satisfaction* of Christ, this Man endeavours to elude those Texts, which do confirm it; so to the same end doth he frame an *Argument* against it, and this it is, *If Christ had made in our stead such a satisfaction, as had been equivalent to the Transgressions of all men, in order to redeem them, how then could life eternal be the free gift of God? how then could we be saved by free Grace? and how could our sins be said to be forgiven?* So he: to which I answer, free Gift, free Grace, are very consistent with that perfect satisfaction, which our Lord hath made to the Justice of God. For,

1. Our Lord himself, who made this satisfaction, was the *free Gift* of God, who first of his own mere motion and goodness promised him without any expectation or *desire*, and afterward sent him without any *merit* in Man. Ac-

cordingly the Evangelist tells us, *God*
Joh. 3. 16. gave his only begotten Son; and our Lord
Joh. 4. 10. styles himself, the Gift of God: and the
Esa. 9. 6. Prophet saith, unto us a Son is given.
 And since our Lord *himself* was freely
 given us, all the *Benefits*, which we
 receive by him and from him, must be
 so too.

2. It was *free Grace* in God the *Son*,
 that he was willing to *make*, and in
 God the *Father*, that he was willing to
accept, such a satisfaction from a *Surety*,
 which he might very justly have ex-
 acted from every one of us, who were
 the *Principal*, and indeed the *only* deb-
 tors. So that this blessed exchange did
 arise merely from the free Grace and
 good Pleasure of God.

3. Though the Pardon of Man's sin,
 and the Salvation of our Souls, *cost*
 our *Surety* very dear; yet this glorious
 purchase comes very *cheap* to us, who
 pay nothing for it: for all the *service*,
 that we can do; all the *Thanks*, that
 we can return; are very justly due to
 God upon *other* accounts.

And this I think is enough to answer
 this Man's Objection; who yet at last
 hath found out another way, and he
 thinks a very full one, to satisfy the
Justice of God, and consequently to
 render

render the satisfaction of Christ needless; for, thus he writes, *The Justice of God is fully satisfied in the certain punishment of Adam's Transgression; for Adam died, and we all die; and by consequence his Justice, as to that offence, is satisfied in all its demands; so satisfied, that this Man saith, 'Tis plain that God in equity can require no more: So he.*

But was a Temporal Death the only Punishment due to Adam's Transgression? there are judicious Men of another mind: the Threatning runs thus, *Thou shalt die the Death*; was it not enough to say, *Thou shalt die*? and why then, *Thou shalt die the Death*? It is the opinion of *Fagius*, *Hac reduplicatione duplicem mortem Anima & Corporis indicari*; and so *Vatablus*, *Mortem Corporis & Anima significat*. This doubling of the Expression imports a double Death, that of the Body, and that of the Soul too; so these learned Men.

Fagius & Vatablus in Gen. 2. 37.

And long before them was *Athanasius* of the same judgment; for about this matter he hath expressed himself thus,

Athan. de incarnat. Christi p. 626.

ὁ Θεὸς διπλὴν τὴν τιμωρίαν τὴν ἀπόφασιν δίδωκε· ὅτι μὴ μόνον εἰρηγός, γὰρ εἰ καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσῃ καὶ ἕως ὑποδύχῃ φθαρτὸν τὸ σῶμα δεσπότου δουλευσάμενος· τῇ δὲ ψυχῇ θανάτου δόξαν καὶ ἕως διαρκείας ὁ

αὐ-

ἀποθνήσκει, ὅτι ἐν δυνάμει οὐρανῶν κα-
 τὰ τὴν ἐκείνου. God denounced a double Pu-
 nishment against Adam for his Trans-
 gression; to his Terrestrial part he said,
*Dust thou art, and to Dust shalt thou re-
 turn,* and by that Sentence is the Body
 of Man become subject to corruption :
 but to his Soul he said, *Thou shalt die the
 Death;* and so Man comes to be divided,
 and condemned to go to two Places,
 by which he means the Grave and
 Hell.

Junius, Tre-
 mellius, &
 Aynsworth
 in locum.

Much the same thing is meant by
 Junius and Tremellius, who thus ex-
 plain this Text, *Thou shalt die the Death;*
 say they, *In mortis corporea & spiritu-
 alis potestate eris,* thou shalt be under
 the Power of Death, both corporeal and
 spiritual. Accordingly doth Aynsworth
 deliver his judgment thus; *In this sen-
 tence the Perdition of Body and Soul are
 implied,*

And indeed there is very great rea-
 son, why this Sentence should reach
 the Soul of Adam; 'tis justly said, *Pa-
 res in Peccato, Pares in Pena:* They,
 who have an equal share in the Sin,
 should have an equal share in the Pu-
 nishment. Now, the truth is, the Soul
 of Adam, and of every Man else, hath
 the far greater share in all Sin; for the
 Body

Body is but *ψυχῆς ὄργανον*, the Soul's Instrument, *Anima famulus*, the Soul's Servant: 'Tis the Soul, which commands and enables the Body according to her own inclinations; and if the Body smart for acting amiss, is it fit that the Soul, which is the Spring of every Action, should quite escape? Certain it is, if a Temporal Death had been the only Punishment of Adam's Sin, his Soul, though deepest in the Guilt, yet, being immortal, must have gone unpunished.

And for this reason the Jewish Rabbines, as Fagius cites them, did grant, *Duplici morte Adamum perisse, anima scilicet & corporis; utrumque in hunc peccavisse, animam scilicet & corpus, ideoque utrumque fuisse punitum*: That Adam perished with a double Death, that of the Soul, and that of the Body too; that he sinned in both, and that therefore he was punished in both. Fagius ubi supra.

Besides, though Adam's Body died, yet must it be raised again, and be made Immortal; and since Adam's Flesh, and every Man's else, must be re-united to their Spirits, and so exist without any End; if a Temporal Death were the only Punishment of Sin, the Resurrection would determine and put a final

a final Period to it; and consequently there must be an Eternal Punishment in another World, unless we grant that the most profligate Wretches, who must be raised again and exist for ever, as well as the most vertuous and pious Souls, shall be equally and eternally happy; for, as to a middle State, there is none.

But notwithstanding all this, our *Socinian* Author, according to his usual Confidence, makes bold to say, *Hell is the Punishment, which is due to the breach of the second Covenant, and not of the first*, and by consequence not to *Adam's* Transgression, which was a breach of the first Covenant only.

This would be very comfortable Doctrine indeed, were it not false; for if it were true, it would secure from Hell all those Persons, how wicked soever, who are in no capacity to break the second Covenant. The conditions of this second Covenant are Faith in Christ and Repentance towards God; to both which those Nations of the World, who never heard of the Gospel, must needs be strangers. And as for natural Fools, and little Babes, who die in their Infancy, they cannot know what the second Covenant means, nor
can

can they well be said either to break or keep it. Now, as the Laws of Men do not oblige us to Obedience, nor punish the want of it, till first they are made known; so neither doth the Law of the Gospel, or second Covenant, require Faith in Christ, or punish the defect of it, where Persons did not, nay could not know it.

And yet what vast Numbers of such ignorant Persons are there, who miscarry and are damned for ever? The Psalmist tells us, *The wicked shall be* Psal. 9.17. *turned into Hell, and all the Nations that forget God;* but what should be the Reason? Is it because they did not perform the Conditions of a second Covenant, which they never heard of? that cannot be; the want of a Christian faith, and an Evangelical Repentance is not the Original cause of any Man's Damnation; but because Faith and Repentance are *Secunda post naufragium tabula*, the only means to prevent that Destruction, which we have otherwise deserved: the want of them doth leave men under that guilt, which they have already contracted; and expose them to that Eternal Punishment, which they have already deserved by breaking the first Covenant, whose Terms run thus, *Do this,*

this, and live; but if not, die and be damned for ever, for so the Scriptures do often explain it.

We cannot reasonably doubt, but the Grace and Mercy offered in the *second* Covenant was designed to deliver Mankind from that *Curse*, whereunto our Violation of the *first* Covenant had too justly rendred all Men obnoxious.

John 1. 29. Our Lord is called the *Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world*, and that sin before our Saviour's time, was nothing else, but the Transgression of the *natural Law* amongst the *Heathens*, printed upon their Hearts, and a fairer Edition of the same delivered to *Moses*, with some positive Precepts among the *Jews*.

Now, our Lord's business was, as Mat. 1. 21. the Angel said, *to save his People from their sins*, from the Dominion, Pollution, Guilt and Punishment of those Sins, with which the World then did, and still doth abound, through the manifold Breaches of the *first* Covenant, or Law of *works*. For that the *moral* Law is still in force, and that the Punishments of *Hell* are due to the Breach of this Law, this doting Scribler would not deny, were he not a double *Heretic*, an *Antinomian*, as well as a *Soci-*

nian.

nian. But were not this Law still in force, to what end did our Lord think fit to *explain* it? were it not still in force, how came our Blessed Saviour to recommend the punctual *observati- on* of it, as the ready way to Heaven and Happiness? and how came the Apostles to press Obedience to it with so much Zeal, and the strongest Mo- tives, that could be thought on?

And if the Punishments of *Hell* were not due, as this Man boldly asserts, to the Transgression of this Law, how comes St. Paul to tell us, *Cursed is every one, that continueth not in all things, which are written in the Book of the Law to do them?* 'Tis evident from this Text, that the least Breach of this Law doth expose the Transgressors of it to the *curse* of God; and what that Curse contains, is evident from that Expres- sion, *Go ye cursed into everlasting Fire.* Accordingly our Lord, who is said, *To redeem us from the Curse of the Law,* is also said, *To deliver us from the wrath to come,* and doth not that import the Punishments of Hell?

Mat. 25. 41.
Gal. 3. 13
1Thes. 1. 10

And indeed if our Lord had not de- livered us from that *Eternal Wrath*, whereunto the Breaches of the *first Co- venant* had exposed us, he had shed his

his Blood in vain, and had delivered us from nothing at all : for from those Punishments, which are due to final *Impenitence* and Unbelief, which are the grand Breaches of the *second* Covenant, there is no Man redeemed by any thing, which Christ hath done or suffered for us. Nay, 'tis so far from this, that a Man's refusal of that Grace and Mercy, which is offered to him upon the Terms of Faith and Repentance by the *second* Covenant, doth *double* that damnation, which he had deserved by breaking the *first*.

But that the Breach of the *first* Covenant doth indeed deserve the Punishment of *Hell*, and that Christ hath freed all believers from it, this incredulous Author will not grant, because our Lord hath not freed believers from the *Grave* ; for thus he saith, *'Tis strange that Christ should free believers from one part of the Punishment, and not from the other ; and then he adds, The Scriptures no where reveal this secret, and for that reason we need not believe it.*

But why this should seem a thing so very strange, what good reason can this Man give us? did he never hear of any merciful Prince, who spared a

condemn'd Malefactor, as to his *life*, the loss whereof would have been his gréatest Punishment, and yet, to make him the more sensible of his Crimes, detained him in *prison* perhaps all his days: doubtless 'tis an Act of Grace to give a condemned Traytor his *life*, though his *liberty* be denied him. So in our present case, it was infinite Mercy in our Lord to rescue us from *Hell*, that place of Torment; though he should never free us from the *Grave*; which to a good Man is but *Kοιμησιον*, a place of *repose* and rest; a place, where our Lord himself was pleased to lie; and the day is coming on apace, wherein our Lord will raise the Dead, and make every good man's body more than amends for all the útmost injuries which the *Grave* can do it.

And as for Death, a religious man need not dread it; for to him, *To die is Gain*: Gain that is great, present, sure, and eternal. To him Death is but a *sleep*, *Est consanguineus lethi sopor*, saith one; nay, *ὕπνος καὶ θάνατος διδύμοις*, saith another; *sleep* and *death* are *Cousin-germans*; they are *Fratres Gemelli*, *Brethren* and *Twins*. When *Lazarus* was dead, our Lord expres-

Phil. i. 21.

Q

sed

Joh. 11. 11. sed it thus, *Our friend Lazarus sleepeth*, and what harm is there in that? When a good man has done his day's work, and is wearied with the drudgery of this World, can it be any disadvantage to him, in the Evening of his Life to lie down and fall asleep? Again, when a good man dieth, he doth not suffer *loss*, but only make a *change*, and that for the better; he changeth *χαλκεια χερσικον*, *Brass for Gold, Earth for Heaven*, the Society of poor *worms* for the Company of glorified *Saints*, and glorious *Angels*; and, which is best of all, for a more immediate *Communion* with God, and all this for ever. And if this be the Case of dying *Saints*, 'tis not, as this man thinks, strange at all, that our Lord, who hath secured them from *Hell*, hath not also saved them from *Death* and the *Grave*.

Our Lord hath told us, and there is great reason for it; *It is enough for the*
 Mat. 10. 25 *servant to be as his Lord*; and if so, can it be strange that our Lord should permit his *Servants* to *die*, and lie in the *Dust* for a while, since he *himself*, and for their sakes, hath done so before them? If we consider, that our Blessed Saviour hath *warmed* our *cold* Bed, and

per-

perfumed our Grave by lying in it; if we consider that he hath plucked out the *sting of Death*, and made it fit to be entertained within our *bosoms*; if we consider what will be the blessed and *immediate consequences* of our dissolution; every good man hath reason enough to esteem it, not as a part of his *punishment* now, though at first it was so, but as his *privilege* rather.

But, saith this bold Author, *The Scriptures do no where reveal this secret, and for that reason, we need not believe it*: I answer, this is *no secret*, for the Holy Scriptures have very plainly *revealed* it, and therefore we are obliged to believe it.

That our Lord hath not excused the very best of Men from Death and the Grave; the Scripture tells us, *Abraham* John 8. 52. *is dead*, and *the Prophets are dead*, and in general, *Death hath passed upon all men*: But the same Scripture tells us, that our Lord hath secured all good men from *Hell*; what else doth St. Paul mean, when he saith, *There is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus*; and again, *Jesus delivers us from the wrath to come*: 'Tis very evident from these and the like Texts, that our Lord hath indeed delivered all

true believers from *Eternal Torments*, but not from a *Temporal Death*; from the *greater* part of our Punishment, but not from that, which was the *lesser*; and will this *Socinian* Babler blame our Lord for doing so? since of his Infinite Mercy he hath freed every good man from *everlasting Burnings*; shall we think much that he hath left us to undergo the *short pangs* of a natural *Death*, and the injuries of the *Grave*, that we might have the more Taste of the bitterness of sin, and become the more sensible of our great Obligations to him, who hath rescued us from the *Extremity* of that Divine Vengeance and endless Misery, which was so justly due to our Transgressions?

That so it is, the Scriptures teach us in many places; there is no Truth more evident; and yet this *Socinian* is either so *blind*, that he cannot; or else *shuts* his Eyes, and *will* not see it; but wonders at it, and counts it strange.

SECT.

SECT. XXVII.

THIS Author, observing no Rules of Method, doth now abruptly attack another Argument used by Orthodox Divines, to prove the Divinity of Christ, and this it is:

That Person, who hath been worshiped by good men, and ought to be so, is God: But our Blessed Saviour is a Person, that hath been worshiped by good men, and ought to be so; *Ergo*, Our blessed Saviour is God.

The major Proposition being indisputable, for the proof of the Minor two things must be shewed: 1. The *matter of fact*, that our Lord hath been religiously worshiped in the most early times of the Gospel by very good men. 2. That our Lord *ought* to be so worshiped.

1. That our Lord hath been religiously worshiped by very good men, even from the very Infancy of the Gospel, is very evident from several Texts. Those early Saints, who lived in the *Apostle's Days*, are described by this Character. They, *who called upon thy Name* -- the Name of *Christ*; such as

Q 3

peti-

petitioned, gave thanks to him, both which are Acts of *Divine Adoration*.

To this and the like Texts this man hath nothing to answer, save only this: 'Tis hard to understand what is there meant by calling upon the Name of Christ; but why so hard? Doth not the familiar use of that same Phrase in abundance of Scriptures make its Sense obvious, plain, and easie? when the *Psalmist* complain'd of the Irreligion of the Heathen World, and expressed it thus;
Ps. 79. 6. They have not called upon thy Name: did he not mean, that they had not performed that worship to God, which was his due? when *St. Paul* saith, *whosoever shall call upon the Name of the Lord, shall be saved*; doth he not mean such Persons as offer up their Prayers and Praises to God, which are the chiefest parts of religious worship? and if this be the usual Sense of this Phrase in these and many other Texts, who is it hard to think, that it should be of the same sense in this?

Well, if such solemn *Invocations* be indeed such Acts of *Religious worship*, which are due to none but God; 'tis evident that our Lord hath been esteemed a God by those pious Men, who made their *Religious Addresses* to him.

him. Whilst he conversed here below, he was petitioned for such favours, as none could bestow but a God. Thus prayed the Father of a distressed Child, *Lord, help my unbelief*; nay, as an Example more considerable, so prayed the Apostles: *They said unto the Lord, Luk. 17. 5. increase our faith*; 'Tis sure, that faith is the gift of God, and so is that Grace and Peace, which, after our Lord's Ascension, St. Paul so often begged, *from God the father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ*. And methinks that dying Protomartyr St. Stephen, who prayed thus, *Lord Jesus receive my spirit*, should put this matter beyond all question.

Now, can we think that all these Petitioners, who wanted and begged such great favours; especially they, who were inspired men, should mistake their benefactor, address themselves to a wrong Person, and begg such boons at a wrong door?

But as good men in the Primitive times, and indeed ever since, have been wont to petition Christ for a supply of their greatest wants; so now, even Saints in Heaven do for ever bless him, as well as Saints on Earth, for such supplies, especially for those matchless kindnesses, which re-

late to another World. So St. John
Apo. 1. 5, 6 tells us, *To him that loved us, and
 washt us from our sins in his blood,
 be Glory and Power for ever and ever;*
Apo. 5. 12. And so again, *Worthy is the Lamb,
 that was slain, to receive Power, Ho-
 nor, and Glory, and Blessing.*

Now, since *Prayers and Praises*,
 which are the main parts of *Religi-
 ous Worship*, have been and still are,
 offered up to *Christ* by the very best
 of men on *Earth*, and *Saints* in *Hea-
 ven*; this is enough to clear the mat-
 ter of fact, and convince this Au-
 thor, that our Lord hath been reli-
 giously worshiped, and is so still.

But, saith this *Socinian Pamphle-
 teer*, no such *Worship* is due to
Christ, nor ought a *Divine Adorati-
 on* to be paid unto him; and for
 this he gives us two Reasons, such
 as they are; 1. The first is this, *The
 Scriptures do no where injoin us to
 make Christ the Object of Divine wor-
 ship.* 2. His second Reason is this;
*The Scriptures do rather exprestly inti-
 mate the contrary, the worshiping of
 Christ is more clearly forbidden than
 required;* so he: To both which I
 answer.

1. That

1. That the Scriptures do no where require us to make Christ the *Object* of *Divine worship* is an assertion, that is utterly false; for we find several commands for it.

We read that *Ananias*, a devout Documentus in locum man, and, as a learned Writer saith, one of the *seventy Disciples*, and a *Deacon* at *Damascus*, was sent by a special Commission to *Saul*, to give him this Command: *Arise, and be* Act 22.16 *baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the Name of the Lord.* Here *Invocation*, a solemn Act of *Religious worship*, is required, and the *Object* of it is the *Lord*; but what *Lord* is it? Doubtless the same *Lord*, who had appeared to *Saul* in the way, and now sent *Ananias* to him, namely, our blessed Saviour; so thought *St. Chrysostom*, who thus expounds it, Chrysostomus in locum.
 Πικαλεισθαι τὸ ὄνομα τῆ Χριστοῦ τῆ-
 ς ἡ δεικνύντι ὅτι αὐτὸν θεὸν ὄντα· ὃν
 γὰρ ἐνὶ ἐπεὶ πῶς Πικαλεισθαι, εἰ μὴ τὸ
 Θεόν, calling upon the Name of *Christ*; and by this injunction did *Ananias*, in effect, assure *Saul* that *Christ* is *God*, since it is not lawful religiously to invoke any other Name, but that of *God*; so that these words of *Ananias* to *Saul*, *wash away thy sins, calling on the Name*
 of

of the Lord, do, in St. Chrysostom's judgment, import thus much: That blessed Person, whose Name is Jesus, whom thou hast lately persecuted, do thou now petition for thy pardon, do thou now worship and adore him as thy God.

But if this Command from *Ananias*, though an inspired Person, were not a sufficient warrant for us to invoke, petition, and worship our blessed Saviour, we have another from *himself*; for thus he tells us, *All men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*; I have already proved in another Section, that this *Kabde*, even as, doth import *ισοτιμια*, *honorem parem*, an Equality of Honor, as the Greek and Latin Interpreters judge, and the Scriptures do warrant. And if so, since God the Father is, and ought to be honoured with a Religious worship, this Text commands us to honour the Son so too.

In short, the Father himself hath required such an Honour for his Son: St. Paul hath told us so. *when he bringeth his first begotten into the world, he saith, let all the Angels of God worship him*: Certainly if Angels, who of all Creatures are the Noblest, and not the most obliged to our Blessed Saviour, must worship

Heb. I. 6.

worship him notwithstanding; then are *poor* men, his *only redeemed* ones, much more bound to do so.

'Tis the known Precept both of the Law and the Gospel, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God*; This is generally acknowledged to be every man's indispensable Duty; and if so, then all those Texts, which do assure us that Christ is our *Lord* and our *God*, do not only *warrant*, but implicitly and consequentially they do *command* us to pay him all that reverential respect and *Religious Service*, which is justly due to God. But,

2. This Author is so far from believing the Truth of this, that he tells us, *the Scriptures do rather intimate the contrary*, they rather *forbid* than *require* the worshiping of Christ.

To prove this, he cites our Lord's own words to his Disciples: *In that day ye shall ask me nothing*, from hence doth this man conclude, that our Lord forewarned his Disciples to pray to him, to beg any thing from him after his Ascension. To which I answer;

The word *ἐρωτᾷτε*, in the Original Language; and the word *Ask*, in our own Tongue, are used in a double Sense; 1. They both do sometimes signify

signify to *enquire*, or propound a question in case of *doubt*. 2. They both do sometimes signify to *crave* an Alms, to beg a gift in case of *want*.

1. These words do sometimes signify to *enquire*, or propound a question in any case of doubt; and thus they are used in many places of the New Testament.

And of this Sense doth this particular Text seem to be very fairly capable; for our Lord's Apostles had hitherto propounded several questions to him; *Lord, whither goest thou?* said St. Peter: *Lord, who is it, that shall betray thee?* So St. John; *Lord, how is it, that thou wilt manifest thy self unto us, and not to the world?* So St. Judas; and after his Resurrection. *Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the Kingdom to Israel?* Now, to prevent future questions, our Lord tells them, *In that day ye shall ask me nothing*; ye shall have no need to propound to me any more questions at all; for, the spirit, whom I will send you, shall resolve all your doubts, and teach you all things.

That this first Sense of these words in this Text is at least very allowable, is the opinion of judicious men; Theophylact expounds it thus; *ye shall ask me*

Theophylact
in locum.

me nothing, Οὐδὲν τοῦτο. οἷον καὶ πάλιν,
 καὶ ὑμεῖς; no such question, as you
 lately did, as *whither goest thou?* &c. Zegerus in
 nay more, there is a learned Critick, locum:
 who supposeth that this sense of these
 words in this place may not only be
 allowed, but ought to be preferred be-
 fore the other; for thus he writes:
Cum tam interrogare, quam rogabitis, nunc
Interrogationem, nunc Precationem indi-
cet; hoc loci non Precationem, sed Percon-
tionem declaret: Although these two
 words do sometimes signifie to pray, and
 sometimes to ask a question, yet in this
 Text they cannot signify the former,
 but the later. So Maldonate, non dubi-
 um, quin hoc loco pro Interrogare positum
 sit: There is no doubt, but when our
 Lord saith, *ye shall ask me nothing*, he
 means no more questions; for, saith
 he, *Nullis jam questionibus locus erit,*
omnia vobis mysteria patefient, ita ut ni-
hil vobis opus sit interrogare: There
 shall then be no more occasion for En-
 quiries, all Mysteries shall be plainly
 revealed unto you, so that ye shall
 have no need to move any further
 questions.

So also do our own Interpreters un-
 derstand this Text, as if our Lord had
 said, *when that spirit is come, he shall*
 have
 Hammondi
 Paraphra-
 sis.

English
Annotati-
ons.

have taught you all things, satisfied all the doubts and ignorances, that you shall not need ask me any more questions, so one single Divine; and thus a greater Number: when ye shall see me risen from the dead, ye shall not then enquire of me those things, which ye now doubt of; you shall be taught of the Holy Ghost, and so understand these things.

Now, if these words of Christ, ye shall ask me nothing, relate, not to *Petitions* in cases of want, but to *Questions* in cases of doubt; then is this Text very impertinently cited by this Man, to prove that the Scriptures do rather forbid than require us to make Christ the Object of Divine worship, by praying to him.

2. These words *ἑγώ* in Greek, *Rogo* in Latin, *Ask* in English; do sometimes signify to beg an *Alms*, a kindness, such or such a favour, in case of some want and necessity; and thus are they often used in the New Testament.

As to the use of these words in this particular Text, St. Chrysostom puts the question thus; τί δὲν, ἡμεῖς ἑγώ; what means our Lord, when he saith, ye shall ask me nothing? he answers, ἡμεῖς δεόμεθα, ἡμεῖς ἀπαιτοῦμεν τὸ θεῖον, ἡμεῖς

μόνον εἰπόντος πάντα λαβεῖν. And after him, *Theophylact* thus, Οὐκ αἰτήσατε ἐμὲ

μεσίτην γὰρ, ἀλλὰ ἀρχίσατε ὑμῖν τὸ ὄνομα με παρὰ τῷ πατρὶος λαβεῖν τὰ αἰτήματα.

Chryso-
stom &
Theophy-
lact. in
locum.

As if our Lord had said, my Father himself will be so ready to grant all your just Requests, that ye shall have no great need to beg my *Personal Intercession*; for the very use of my *Name* will be enough to prevail with my Father for a supply of all your real Wants; so they. But that they should even thus interpret this Text: *Mirror* saith *Maldomate*, I do somewhat wonder.

St. *Augustin* tells us, that to find out the true meaning of these words, *ye shall ask me nothing, acior necessaria est intentio*: There needs a sharp and acute *Judgment*, an extraordinary attention of mind, the Text being very difficult to be understood. But can this *Socinian Scribler*, or any man else of his opinion, produce the Authority of any *Ancient Fathers*, or other learned *Divines*, who affirmed these words, *ye shall ask me nothing*, to be an absolute prohibition from Christ, forbidding us to offer up our *Prayers* to him: Such an Inference from this Text, that great man St. *Augustin* disclaims, and that with

Augustin.
in Joan.
Tract. 101.
p. 107.
Tom. 9.

with heat of zeal and indignation; for thus he writes: *Quis audeat vel cogitare, vel dicere, in caelo sedentem Christum rogandum non esse? rogandum non esse Immortalem, rogari debuisse mortalem?* What man dares to say, nay, to think that Christ, now sitting in Heaven, may not be invoked? was he to be petitioned even *then*, when he was a mortal man, and may he not be petitioned *now* in the State of his *Immortality*? yes, St. *Austin* adviseth us to it, and that in relation to this very Text, which, as this man saith, doth rather forbid it; for, thus that Father writes: *Rogemus eum, ut nodum questionis hujus ipse dissolvat, lucendo in cordibus nostris, ad videnda quae dicit*: Let us pray to Christ, and beg, that he himself would untie this hard knot, enlightning our minds, that we may understand the true meaning of those things which he here delivers.

Augustinus
ibidem.

But whatever the sense of these words may be, if our Lord did therein forbid his Apostles to ask any thing of him after his Ascension, either they did not *understand* this Command, or else they *knowingly* and frequently *transgressed* it; but we cannot reasonably charge them either with such gross

igno-

ignorance, or with such wilful and repeated Acts of *disobedience* to a known Command of that Lord, for obeying whom they laid down their Lives.

We read that our Lord, having blest his Apostles, was parted from them, and went up to Heaven; and what then? the next news is this: *They worshipped him*, but is it reasonable to believe, that they would so soon have worshipped their Lord, had he so lately forbid them that *Religious Invocation*, which is the most solemn part of *Divine Worship*? And methinks, *St. Paul* should know nothing of such a prohibition, when he so often begg'd *Grace and Peace*, as *from God the Father*, so *from our Lord Jesus Christ*; but, above all, *St. Stephen* must either be grossly ignorant of this Prohibition, or notoriously slight it, when, seeing our Lord standing at God's Right-hand; he directed his Prayer, not to God the Father, *Acts 7. 59.* but to the Son, breathing out this *Petition*, and his Soul immediately after it, *Lord Jesus, receive my spirit*: But that *St. Stephen* should be so extremely mistaken, as to address himself and his greatest and last Request to a wrong Object, cannot be reasonably supposed, since he was *a man full of the Holy Ghost.* *Acts 7. 55.*

R

In

In short, since these words of Christ, *ye shall ask me nothing*, are difficult to be understood; since the word, *Ask*, is, *λέξις πολύσημη*, a word of various significations; and sometimes in case of *want*, and sometimes in case of *doubt*; and since in this later sense 'tis generally thought to be most applicable to this particular Text; 'tis impossible from hence to draw a conclusive Argument against our making Christ the *Object* of our *Divine Worship*, by offering up our *Prayers* to him; an Act, whereunto we are the more encouraged by the great *Examples* of *inspired men*, who, since the delivery of these words, *ye shall ask me nothing*, directed their *Petitions* to him, and *adored* him, as *God*, by their solemn and religious *Invocations*.

But that unwarrantable Assertion, which this Text cannot prove, this Man endeavours to confirm by an Argument; for *should* we, saith he, *put Christ instead of the true God, and make him alone the Object of Prayer and Thanksgiving, we should deprive him, as much as in him lieth, of his Mediatory Office; yea, and also deny the Godhead of the Father*: This is the whole substance of his Argument. To which I answer;

This

This man doth here seem to suppose a Practice, which he obliquely imputes to us, who make Christ the Object of our Worship, as if we put him instead of the true God, and made him *alone* the Object of our Prayers and Thanksgivings. This Imputation is utterly false and altogether undeserved; for, indeed we cannot put Christ instead of the *true* God, except we can put him instead of *himself*; for the true God he is, and St. John plainly tells us so. Nor do we make the Person of Christ *alone* the Object of our *Prayers* and *Thanksgivings*; for we pray to the *whole* Trinity; sometimes *severally* to each Person, and sometimes *jointly* to them *all*. And in our *Doxologies* and *Thanksgivings* our known form is this, *Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost*; and how then do we make Christ *alone* the Object of our Worship?

Nor do we by this Practice, as this man slanderously insinuates, do any thing, which tends to deprive our Lord of his *Mediatorship*; we own, as St. Paul doth; *That there is One, and, but One Mediatour betwixt God and Man, even, the Man Christ Jesus*: We pray to him as our *Advocate* and on-

ly Intercessour, that he will plead for us, and stand as a Reconciler betwixt his offended Father, and ourselves offending Sinners. And how this Practice doth either rob Christ of his Office, or deny the Godhead of his Father, as this man affirms, I am yet to learn.

SECT. XXVIII.

THE next thing, which this Author attempts, is to discourse of Scripture *Mysteries*, and here his Design is to overthrow the *Mysterious Doctrines* of the Blessed Trinity, by charging it with Contradictions and Impossibilities: for, thus he writes;

If we are to believe Mysteries, when clearly revealed, yet that doth not oblige us to believe Impossibilities and Contradictions; I answer,

That we are to believe *Mysteries*, when clearly revealed from Heaven, is so certain a Truth, that if this Man doubt it, as he seems to do, he is an *Infidel*, as well as an *Heretick*. But suppose, that we are so to believe, yet, saith he, *it doth not from thence fol-*
low,

low, that therefore we must believe *Impossibilities and Contradictions*. His meaning is, as is evident from the Design of his whole Book, that we are not bound to believe the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity*; because, in his opinion, there are *Impossibilities and Contradictions* in it.

But doth this presuming *Mechanick* perfectly understand the *Infinite* perfections of the incomprehensible God? Can he give us a just Account of his *Eternity* without *Succession*? Or his *Omnipresence* without *Extension*? Can he tell us, how any Being should be of and from it self, and yet such a Being there must be, and that without a Beginning? If this man doth not fully comprehend the *Nature* of God, the *Infinity* of his Essence, and the *Extent* of his unlimited Power, how dares he charge that *Doctrin* with *Impossibilities and Contradictions*, which this great God hath so *clearly* and so *frequently* revealed for a certain Truth, and which this man doth not, cannot understand.

But the Truth is, there is nothing of *Contradiction* in what the Scriptures deliver concerning the *Trinity*; we are there told that there is but *One* true

Epiphan.
in Pan.
Hær. 74.
p. 891.

Epiphan.
in Pan.
adv. Hær.
l. 3. Tom. 2.
p. 1084.

Epiphanius
ubi supra.

God, and we believe it; we are also there as plainly told, that there are *Three Persons* in the *Godhead*, and we do equally believe that too, and so have the generality of good men done before us. So testified *Epiphanius* of his and former times, ἐν θεοφάσις ἀγίας τρεῖς ἡμῖν καταγέληται καὶ πιστεύεται, ἀπερίεργος, καὶ ἀφιλονεικός. In the Holy Scriptures the Trinity is declared unto us, and is believed, and that without any curious *Questions* or *Contentions* about it; and so it was in the Ages before him; so he intimates elsewhere: ὁ χριστιανισμὸς ὄντας αἰνομασίμηνος θελήματι τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ υἱοῦ, καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος, μετὰ πάντων τῶν κατὰ γενεὰν Θεῶν ἐναρεσποῦντων πιστευόμενοι. The Religion called *Christian*, by the good pleasure of the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, hath been believed by all men, who pleased God in their respective Generations. And this Trinity thus believed, he thus describes: τρεῖς ἅγιοι, τρεῖς συνάγιοι, τρεῖς ἐνυπόστατοι, τρεῖς συνυπόστατοι ἀλλήλοις συνόντες· μία συμφωνία, μία Θεότης αὐτῆς δυνάμεως, &c. There are *Three Holy ones*, *Three equally Holy*, *Three Subsistences*, *Three equal Subsistences*, being each joined to one another, being of one Consent, one God.

Godhead, and the same Power, &c. but then he adds, το ὅ πᾶς, αὐτοῖς δοξαζομένη διδάσκει. But as to the manner, how this should be, it must be left to these blessed Persons themselves to teach us.

And since the Doctrin of the Trinity hath in all Ages been received as an undoubted Article of our Christian Faith, by the Generality of judicious men; we may conclude, that they, who believed it, discovered no *impossibilities*, no *Contradictions* in it; and if there were none in their Ages, the Doctrin being still the same, there can be none in ours. Indeed, were we told, that there is but *One* God, and yet that there are *Three* Gods, this were a plain Contradiction, and consequently impossible that both the Propositions should be true; but when we are told, that there is but *One* God, and yet *Three* Persons, each of which is God, there is no Contradiction in this; because their *Divine* Nature, Essence and Infinite Perfections are numerically the same. And although our shallow understanding cannot dive into this deep Mystery, nor apprehend how it should be so; yet ought we to be so far from judging it *impossible*,

R 4

that

that we are obliged firmly to *believe* that so it is, because it is as clearly delivered in the Scriptures, and I think as consonant to humane Reason, as some *other* Articles of our Faith, which yet most men within the Church pretend to believe.

Origen.
contra I. 5.
p. 24. Edit.
Cantabrig.

The *Resurrection* of the Dead is a Doctrin attended with such *Intricacies*, and so many Difficulties, that humane Reason scarce knoweth how to admit it for a certain truth, though indeed it be so. In St. Paul's time it was thought to be *ἀναιδωτον*, a thing *Incredible*, and *Celsus* in *Origin* styles it *ἀδύνατον*, a thing *impossible*, and yet we believe, not only that it *may*, but *must* be. Now, as there are some things in Nature, which are looked upon as *Types*, *Emblems*, and *Representations* of the *Resurrection*; so likewise are there some instances in Nature, which, though they cannot be urged as *proofs* for the *certainly*, yet may serve as useful *illustrations* to help our weak Apprehensions, and somewhat *facilitate* our belief as to the *Possibility* of the *Trinity*. As for instance; there is in every living Man a *Rational*, a *Sensitive*, and a *Vegetive* Soul; and yet the Soul of Man is but *One*; so here, there is in the Deity a *Father*,

Father, a Son, and an Holy Ghost, and yet the Deity is but One. Only here is the difference, Reason, Sense, and Vegetation, are but three essential and distinct Faculties, or Powers of one and the same Soul; whereas, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are three essential and distinct Subsistences in one and the same Godhead; and for the belief of this, the Scripture is our only Authentick Warrant.

But that we have there any such Warrant, this man denieth, and like one out of his wits tells us, *when a Mystery is plainly expressed in some places of Scripture, if others more numerous and plain had affirmed the contrary, or had it been contradicted by any self-evident Principle of Reason, we might then have rejected the belief thereof as safely, and with as good Authority, as we now do that of the Popish Transubstantiation, which by the way is as expressly contained in Scripture, as is that of the Trinity; so he. To which I answer: In this expression there is both Blaspheemy and Falshood.*

1. In this expression there is *Blaspheemy*, and it lieth in that vile supposition of his, *when a Mystery is plainly revealed in some places of Scripture, if others*

others more numerous and plain had affirmed the contrary; in plain English, had God contradicted himself, a suggestion so blasphemous, a supposition so abominable, that he who raised it, wants and deserves a Room in *Bethlehem*, or in some other *Mad-house*.

For this supposition can no way tend to promote this man's accursed Design; for, it doth insinuate, that the *mysterious* Doctrine of the Trinity, which concession is enough for us, is plainly revealed in some places of the Scripture; and although he makes bold to intimate, that it is as plainly contradicted in many more; yet when he shall be at leisure to shew us that such and such Texts, relating to the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, are inconsistent, and clash with one another: We doubt not, but we shall very easily and very fairly reconcile alone, and make up a perfect and lasting Peace, and a very friendly correspondence between them.

2. In this expression of his our Author asserts a down-right *Falshood*; for he thus affirms, *The Doctrine of the Popish Transubstantiation, is as expressly contained in the Scripture, as is that of the Trinity.*

But

But is this man a Member of any reformed and Protestant Church? could the whole Society of Jesuits have said more in favour of their beloved Transubstantiation, and in so few words, than this man hath done? could he make good, what he hath said, he would well deserve a Cardinal's Cap, if not a Triple Crown.

But there lieth a strong Prejudice against this unwarrantable Assertion; for if this Doctrin of Transubstantiation be, as this man saith, as expressly contained in the Scripture, as is that of the Trinity; how came to it pass, that the one should not be receiv'd and established as an undoubted Article of the Christian Faith, as early as the other?

Irenaeus tells us thus; *Ἡ ἀληθινὰ, καὶ πρὸς ἅλους τῆς οὐνοῦ διασπαρμένη, &c.*

Irenaeus
adv. Hæ.
h. 1. c. 2.

the Church, tho then dispersed throughout the whole World, received the Doctrin of the Trinity,

Ἐκ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν μαθητῶν, from

Ignatius in
Ep. ad Philad.

the Apostles and their Disciples; of whom Ignatius was one; who in his Epistles to several Churches, and particularly in the Inscription of that to Philadelphia, doth distinctly mention the Three Persons of the Trinity, which is an Argument that they were all own-

ed

ed and adored as one God in his early Days.

Isaacus
Vossius in
præf. ad
Iogna. Epist.

Chemnit.
in Exam.
Concilii
gridentini
p. 271.

So that for the general Reception and Belief of the Doctrin of the Trinity, we may justly plead *Prime Antiquity*, even before the Days of *Irenæus* Bishop of *Lyons* in *France*, in the second Century, a Disciple of *Polycarp*; and in the time of *Ignatius*, whom *Isaac Vossius* styles; *Martyr gloriosissimus, Coetaneus, & amicus Apostolorum*, a most glorious Martyr, contemporary with the Apostles, and a Friend of theirs. But can any Plea of such *Antiquity* be justly offered for the *Romish* Doctrin of *Transubstantiation*? when this Doctrin first began to be obtruded upon the Church as a necessary Article of the Christian Faith, we have this just Account from the Pen of a learned Man: *Innocentius Tertius circa Annum Domini millesimum ducentessimum in Lateranensi Concilio, modum conversionis, antè in Ecclesia non definitum, primus determinavit, & dogmati novo novam etiam indidit & accommodavit appellationem, &c.* Pope *Innocent* the Third about the *Twelfth* Century in the *Lateran* Council was the first Man, who determined the manner, how the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist are converted, into the real Body

Body and Blood of Christ, and to this New Doctrin, never defined till now, he gave and fitted a new Name, that of *Transubstantiation*.

Now, may we not here very justly demand, whence was it that this Doctrin of *Transubstantiation* should be utterly unknown to Prime Antiquity? if it be as expressly contained in the Scripture, as the Doctrin of the *Trinity*; why was *this* so early and so generally professed, when the other was not so much as thought on? certainly, the only reason must be this: *Ignatius, Clemens Romanus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian*, and many other learned Men in the succeeding Ages, could find the Doctrin of the *Trinity* clearly revealed in the *Holy Scriptures*; but as for that Monster of *Transubstantiation*, they could there with their best Eyes find neither the word, nor the thing intended by it.

For the Truth is, it is not there; 'tis a New Doctrin, to which our *Evangelists* and *Apostles* were perfect Strangers; in all their Writings there is, not only no sure footing, but not so much as a plausible Pretence for it; 'tis opposed by Sense, by Reason, by
seve-

several *Scriptures*, but countenanced by none; insomuch that although some learned Men, out of a base compliance with the Interests of the *Roman Church*, plead for it; yet we may justly think, that they themselves do not, cannot believe it. The *Scriptures*, which deliver the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity* are familiar, plain, and easie; such as must be understood in their common, natural, and *literal Sense*, and are incapable of any other tolerable Interpretation. But those Texts, which are usually cited in favour of *Transubstantiation*, are *improper, figurative, metonymical*, and in a *literal Sense* impossible to be true.

Such are those expressions of our Blessed Saviour, who said of the Bread, being then in his Hand; *This is my Body*, and of the Wine, *This is my Blood*; and again, *This Cup is the New Testament*: All this is true in that Sense, which our Lord intended; but that must needs be *Tropical*; we cannot doubt, but Joseph spake truth, when interpreting *Pharaoh's Dream*, he told him thus; *The seven good kine are seven years*, and it was a truth, which was thus told St. John; *The seven Candles are the seven Churches*, and

Mat. 26.

26. 28.

Luk. 22. 20

Gen. 41. 26

Apoc. 1. 20.

our

our Lord spake truth, when he said, *I am the Door, the Vine, the Bread, which came down from Heaven, &c.* All these Texts are fairly capable of a figurative Sense, but impossible to be true in any other.

So here, when our Lord said of Bread and Wine; *This is my Body, This is my Blood*; his Speech must be metonymical, and his meaning must be this: Bread in this Sacrament shall be used by my Institution to represent my Body, and Wine my Blood, even as the seven golden Candlesticks represented the seven Churches. And thus do the Ancient Fathers, who never dreamed of Transubstantiation, expound this Text, *Hoc est corpus meum, id est, Figura corporis mei*: This is my Body, that is to say, this is the Figure of my Body, so Tertullian. And thus St. Austin, *Non dubitavit Dominus dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum signum daret corporis sui*: Our Lord did not doubt to say, *This is my Body*, when he gave the sign of his Body, the Bread. St. Chrysostom styles the Sacrament Bread and Wine; *τὰ σύμβολα*, Tokens of Christ's Body and Blood. St. Hierom saith, that by this Bread and Wine our Lord was pleased; *Veritatem corporis & sanguinis*

Tertull.
adv. Marc
l. 4. c. 4.
p. 458.

Aug. cont.
Adimant.
c. 12. p. 41.

Chrysost.
in Mat.
Hom. 82.
Hierom. in
Mat. 26. 26

nis

nis sui representare, To represent the Truth of his Body and Blood : Now, if the Bread be, what *Tertullian* calls it, the *Figure* of Christ's Body ; if it be as *St. Austin* saith, the *sign* of his Body ; if the Bread and Wine be, as *St. Chrysostom* speaks, *Symbols* and *Tokens* ; or, as *St. Hierom* expresseth it, *Representations* of our Lord's Body and Blood ; then these words of Christ ; *This is my Body*, *This is my Blood*, are *metonymical* ; and being so : They give no countenance to the *Romish* Doctrin of *Transubstantiation*.

Chemnitii
Exam.
Conc. Tri-
dent. p.
272.

And since this Text doth not prove that Doctrin, there is no other, that can so much as be pretended for it, without force and violence ; nay, some *Popish* Writers themselves, as *Chemnitius* testifieth, do confess thus much ; *Nec verbis Scripturae, nec symbolis fidei, nec veterum sententiis cogi nos ad Dogma Transubstantiationis* ; we are not obliged to believe the Doctrin of *Transubstantiation* by any word of *Scripture*, by any publick *Confession* of the Christian Faith, nor by any declared judgment of Ancient Writers ; whereas by every one of these *Authorities* the Doctrin of the *Trinity* is confirmed and established.

Not

Nor is it any wonder that it should be so; for the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is grounded upon such Texts, as every man of sense and reason, who is not intoxicated and miserably forestalled with groundless Prejudices, must needs acknowledge to be improper and *metonymical*; whereas the Doctrine of the *Trinity* is delivered in such words as are plain, easie, and incapable of any figure. St. John saith, *The word was God*; again he saith of Christ, *This is the true God*. St. Thomas stiles him, *My Lord, and My God*. St. Paul stiles him, *God blessed for ever*; St. John saith, *There are Three that bear record in Heaven*; and our Lord himself hath named them; the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost*. Now, are not all these Texts, familiar, obvious, and very intelligible? Can we imagine, that any Trope should be in them? the generality of the most judicious Interpreters have understood them in their *literal* sense; and why they should now be expounded any other way, neither this Man, nor any of his Abettors, will ever be able to give us one solid reason.

And yet this *illiterate Mechanick*, in conformity to the rest of his Book, makes bold to affirm this notorious

S

falsehood;

falsehood, That the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, which is grounded upon the *literal* sence of a Text or two, which being so understood, can never be *true*, is as expresly contained in the Scripture, as the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, which yet is built upon such plain Texts, wherein no *figure* can be found; nor can they fairly be understood in any sence, save only that which is *literal*.

SECT. XXIX.

FROM hence this Author proceeds to discourse of *Faith* and *Reason*; and here he tells us, *That our Faith doth not bind us to give our assent to that, which we see no Reason to believe*: And again he saith, *No kind of Faith can be true, which is certainly unreasonable*. And for that his Argument is this: *The light of Nature is as much God's law, as Divine Revelation, and none must ever think, that God's law can contradict it self*: But why then did this very Man in one of his former Paragraphs suppose it?

Well,

Well, by all this he means, that we are not obliged by our *Faith* to assert the Doctrine of Christ's *Divinity*, nor consequently to that of the *Trinity*, because *humane* Reason is not able to apprehend how one and the same *numerical* Nature should equally subsist in *Three distinct Persons*, and how the *Divine* and *Humane* Nature should meet and be united in *One*: To which I answer;

The ground, rule, and measure of *Theological Faith* is the *Testimony* of God, not *Humane Reason*; and this *Divine Testimony*, which is the only standard of saving Faith, is recorded in our Bibles, and we are obliged to believe whatever we find to be clearly delivered therein for a truth, tho' the matter of it be so *sublime*, that the *low* understanding of Man cannot reach it. It was necessary for the *Jewish Nation* to give a firm assent to that Prediction, *Behold, a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son*; and yet such a Conception and Birth, according to the common Course of Nature, to *Humane Reason* must seem impossible. And are we not all obliged to believe the *Creation* of the World out of *nothing*, and the *Resurrection* of the Dead out of inter-

Isa. 7. 14

termingled and scattered Atoms, both which have been derided by Men of great Reason, as if these great Doctrines were no better than *ridiculous Fables*?

But when we consider the *Veracity* and *Omnipotence* of God, we have all reason undoubtedly to believe whatever he hath revealed for a truth; his *αὐτὸς ἐφη, Ipse dixit*, is sufficient; for, who dares question the *Power* of that great God, who by a *word* created the Universe: and who dares suspect the *Truth* of the same God, for whom it is *impossible to lye*? All that the *Reason* of Man hath to do about Doctrines of *Faith*, is only this; we are to exercise our understandings to their very utmost capacity, and to use the very best helps we can get, to find out the true *meaning* of such or such a Text; and when once that is done, whatever Doctrine may be contained in any Text being rightly understood, we must not dispute its *possibility*, we must not oppose our own *reasonings* to it, but readily embrace it as an object of our Faith.

And whereas this Man saith, *The light of Nature is as much God's law, as Divine Revelation*; we grant, that the *primitive* and uncorrupted *light* of Nature during that very short time of
Man's

Man's Innocence, was so indeed. There was then in Man, as the School-men speak, *Cognitio plena & lucida, clara & fixa contemplatio intelligibilium*; Adam, say they, *habuit scientiam omnium naturaliter scibilium*, He had the knowledge of all things, which by natural Principles might be known. But is it so with us now? do not even the things of Nature and their occult Qualities puzzle the most improved understandings of Men? how was that great Philosopher Aristotle himself confounded, and perplexed in his uncertain thoughts, about the motions of Euripus? was it not the confession of Socrates, that all his natural light served only to convince him of his own darkness and ignorance, that the only thing, which he certainly knew, was that he knew nothing? and how very little doth Man know of himself? how little doth he know of Angels? and how much less of God? there is still the same *Objectum cognoscibile*, the same objects of knowledge; but our *Virtus cognoscitiva*, our knowing faculty, is strangely altered for the worse.

The light of Nature, by and ever since Adam's Fall, hath been eclipsed; the law of Nature hath been so miserably

Prov. 20.
27.

rably *blurred* and blotted, that God Almighty, being moved by his *own mercy* and *our necessity*, was pleased to give us a *new* and fairer *Edition* of it in the *Decalogue*, and expositions of it in other parts of our Bibles. And for this we stand much obliged to Heaven; for the law, *written* in the *heart*, being so strangely obliterated, there was great need of a fresh and clear *Transcript* in the *Book*; the light of Nature was indeed for a short time, *the only Candle of the Lord*; but now, there being a *Thief* got into it, and a great deal of *snuff* lying in it; the clearer light of *Revelation* was become so absolutely necessary, that God was pleased to send his *Prophets*, his *Apostles*, and his *own Son*, to inform the World, and to rectify those gross Errors in matters both of *civil Manners* and *religious worship*, into which the dim light of Nature had led the generality of Mankind.

The light of our corrupted Nature is now, at best, but a *small* and *diminutive* light, and hath often proved a *false* light too; compared with the light of *Divine Revelation*, 'tis no more than the light of a *Glow-worm* to that of a *Star*, or the light of a *small spark* to that of the *Sun*. Now, since this Man

will

will not believe the Doctrine of the glorious Trinity, which the *light* of Divine Revelation hath so clearly discovered, because he cannot apprehend it by the *dim* Light of Nature; let him take heed, lest that light of Nature, upon which he so much depends, as to believe nothing true, which that doth not discover, do not in the end prove darkness; for, if it do, *How great* Mat. 6.23. *is that darkness?*

But our Author goeth on, and to magnifie the reason of Man, he tells us, *'Tis the agreement even of the Scripture with humane Reason, that makes us know it to be the word of God;* so he. To which I answer;

The Precepts of the Scripture, being morally good, just, and equal, are very agreeable to the right reason of Man; an enlightned understanding cannot but like them well; but this is not the only *Character*, whereby the *Divinity* of the Scriptures may be proved. Indeed, were its Precepts unholy, and contrary to the dictates of sound reason, it could not be the word of God; but yet the agreeableness of its Commands to the rectified reason of Man, is not enough to evidence that it certainly is so. For we find

many excellent *Precepts* of the same kind with those in the Scripture delivered by *Heathen Moralists*, whose Writings yet are not counted *sacred*.

But we know the Scriptures to be the word of God by evidences of another kind. As for instance; 'tis impossible that the Scriptures should be the word of *Men* or *Angels*, good or bad, as might be easily proved; and if so, they must needs be from *God*. And that indeed they are so, may be further evidenced by the exact accomplishment of such *Prophecies*, as foretold the most *improbable Events*; to which I need add no more Proofs, save only those stupendious *Miracles*, which were often and openly wrought purposely to *confirm* those *Doctrines*, which our Bibles contain; Miracles not only delivered in the Scripture, but attested and recorded by other Writers.

These are some of those motives, which induce us to believe that the Scriptures are the infallible word of that God, by whose certain *Prescience* such *future Events* were foretold, and by whose *Omnipotence*, such *miraculous works*, as astonished their *Spectators*, were effected. But as to the agreement of Scripture with *humane Reason*,

Reason, to urge that, as this Author seems to do, as the *only* or *principal* Medium, whereby we may prove or know its Divinity, is a new way of arguing: a *Topick*, which being alone without the conjunction of other and *better Evidences*, is, I think, peculiar to this Man only.

But I must crave to mind this Person, that there are in the Scriptures some matters of *Speculation*, some Doctrines of *Faith*, which are not very *suitable* to *humane Reason*; but far *above* the capacity of finite understandings. Such is the Doctrine of the *Creation*; for, *Ex nihilo nil fit*, saith the Reason of Man; and such is the Doctrine of the *Resurrection*, which Men of great understanding have thought to be *needless*, *inconvenient*, and *impossible*. And such is the Doctrine of the blessed *Trinity*, and the *Union* of the *Divine* and *Humane* Natures in the Person of Christ; Doctrines transcending the highest reach of humane Understandings; and yet being contained in the word of God, there lieth upon every Christian a necessary obligation to believe them.

To this our Author, in his 46th Page, makes this reply; *A Just God can ne-*

ver

ver lay on us a necessity of submitting to those Terms and Conditions of Salvation, which we cannot possibly understand: So he.

Bold worm! who dares not only deny the Divinity of the Son, but also dispute the Justice of the Father; but suppose that God had dealt with Men, as he dealt with Angels; suppose that he had propounded to us *no* Terms of Salvation, had he even so been *unjust*? if not, since his own free mercy inclined him to offer us some Conditions; is it fit, that *He* or *we*, should chuse them: and if his conditions do not please us, must we presently charge him with *injustice*, as, in effect, this Man doth? But, let him tell us, whether God, whose we are upon all accounts, may not, without any breach of his own Justice, command his Creature Man to do any thing, which may be *lawfully* done, in order to his Salvation? if he may, then may he justly require us to believe the Truth of all his own Revelations, tho' the matter, contained in some of them, be far above our comprehension.

True it is, we cannot apprehend how the Divine Nature, which is *numerically* but *One*, should be communicated to *Three distinct Persons*, and *entirely* *subsist* in each; nor are we able to apprehend

prehend the manner how the finite Nature of Man, should be united to the infinite Nature of God in the Person of Christ, ἀρετῆς, ἀουχίας, ἀγέλης, ἀδυσχελίας, without conversion, confusion, or possibility of separation for ever. But though we cannot comprehend these matters; yet our reason tells us, that we ought to believe them, because the Scriptures do declare them either in express Terms, or by undeniable Consequences.

So that about these mysterious Points we are not to consult our reason, whether it be fit to believe them; but whether the Scriptures rightly understood do indeed contain them; and if once we find them there, our own Understandings must needs submit to Divine Revelation, and own them all, how difficult soever they be, as the undoubted Truths of God.

Now, whether the true meaning of such or such a Text be this or that, the Reason of Man must be the Judge; and consequently Men of the most improved Understandings, being also pious, sincere, and impartial, are the fittest Persons in the World to determine, upon mature advice and deliberation, regard being had to the Analogy of Faith,

Faith and all necessary *Circumstances*, whether such or such a Text do signify so or so.

This being thus premised, I do now appeal to every impartial Reader, whether it be not more safe, and more reasonable for us to understand those Texts, which are usually produced to prove the *Trinity*, as the *most*, the *best*, the *most devout*, the *most learned*, and the *most judicious* Writers of the *Catholick Church* have generally understood them, than to understand them as this Man, and a few more of his opinion, do interpret them against the judgment of *Prime Antiquity*, and the *received Faith* of the *Christian Church* in succeeding Ages.

SECT. XXX.

THE Doctrine of the *Trinity* being thus far opposed, and denied by this *Seraphical Divine*; he now attempts the Work of a *Casnist*, debating, or rather determining the *future State* of all them, who *believe* that Doctrine, which he *disowns*, and the best thoughts, which he entertains concerning us poor silly *Trinitarians*, he declares

clares in this undoubted Maxim of his *Salvation*, and the *belief of the Trinity* are not inconsistent : So he.

This favourable *Aphorism* contains the very highest Charity, which, in this Man's opinion, can be extended to us, or to any of those pious Persons, who formerly lived and died in the Faith of the *Trinity*; the whole of his kindness lieth in this, that although he thinks us to be very near the *Suburbs of Hell*, because we believe, what his *infallible Reason* tells him cannot be; yet he doth not universally exclude us from all *hopes of Heaven*.

And though this Act of Charity be in it self but very *small*, yet in a Man of his Principles 'tis somewhat *strange*; 'tis such, as in him cannot arise from Nature, Judgment and Deliberation, unless he resolve to contradict the *Scriptures* in this, as he often doth in other matters. For, considering his *Principles*, through his groundless Charity, he thinks some of us to be in a *capacity of Heaven*, not only *without a warrant*, but even *against* the expresse Testimony of God. For, this Man, who denieth the *Divinity of Christ* and the *Holy Ghost*, doth well know, that we adore them *both* as God, and give them the

the self same *worship* and Honour, which we give to God the Father; and if so, this Man, who believes that Christ and his Spirit are not God, must needs count us, who worship both as God, to be down-right *Idolaters*; that such we *live*, that such we *die*; and were we such indeed, St. Paul tells what our fate must be, when he saith, *Idolaters shall not inherit the Kingdom of God*. And if so, how comes this Man, who esteems us to be obstinate and impenitent *Idolaters*, to lay down this positive Conclusion, *Salvation and the belief of the Trinity are not inconsistent*? may not any Man of his opinion say as well, *Salvation and Idolatry, persisted in, and without Repentance, are not inconsistent, though St. Paul be of another mind*?

But this excess of his superlative Charity this Man thought fit by and by to *qualifie* and moderate thus; Doubtless the belief of a Trinity *must* needs much lessen the future happiness of pious and just Men, though not wholly debar them of their Salvation; so he.

'Tis well for us, that this Man will allow us any place, *Inter sanctorum pedes*, even the lowest Room in Heaven; it will be happy for us, if we can but shine like the Stars in the *Via lactea*,
those

those *Gemms* of the least Magnitude; but why this assuming Person should reserve and appropriate the *highest Orbs*, the greatest Degrees of Glory, to and for Men of his own perswasion, I am yet to learn. But this I know, that his great Grandfathers *Ebion, Cerinthus, Arius, Sabellius, Macedonius, Socinus*, and some others with their Successors, do stand condemned by the *Catholick Church* for a *Pack of Hereticks*, and have been sufficiently proved to be such indeed; and if so, I cannot think that they are like to be advanced to the *most glorious Mansions* in Heaven, since *Heresie*, as well as *Immorality*, if *St. Paul* saith true, doth debar Men from having *any Room* there at all.

However, as to the *Degrees* of future Glory, the Doctrine of the *Schools* is this; they tell us, that in Heaven there is, *Aurea & Aureola*, this latter they stile, *Premium essentiale additum*, an *Additional Reward* over and above that, which is *essential* to the happiness of glorified Saints in common. *Aquinas* describes it thus, *Corona quaedam non omnibus, sed quibusdam specialiter red-dita*; a certain *Crown* bestowed not upon *all Saints*, but upon some particular

Per-

*Aquin. in
suppl. qu.
96. Art. 1.
& 11.*

Persons for some special Reasons. And who those *most* happy Persons are like to be, he elsewhere tells us, *Virgines, Martyres, Pradicatores*. Virgins, Martyrs, and Preachers. Now, we cannot doubt, but there have been many *Trinitarians*, in whom these *three* Characters have happily met; such as were untainted *Virgins*, noble *Martyrs*, and laborious *Preachers* too. Tell me then, shall their *belief* of the *Trinity* eclipse their Lustre, and intercept any *part* of their future Glory? shall their *Faith* diminish, and pare off one jot of that great Reward, whereunto their *Vertues* did entitle them? If this Man thinks so, let him prove it at his leisure; for as yet he hath done no more than *boldly* affirmed, that doubtless so it is, and needs must be so; but he hath yet given us no good reason why.

There is indeed one Text, which he cites, as if it gave some countenance to his opinion: I mean that of the Apostle, which this Man doth falsely transcribe, but thus it runs: *If any man build upon this foundation, wood, Hay, Stubble, he shall suffer loss, yet himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire; where by wood, Hay, and Stubble, Theophylact*
means,

1 Cor. 3. 10

means, τὰς πονηρὰς πράξεις, the evil Actions of a vicious Life; and before him St. Chrysostom, who saith, δὴλον, ἐπὶ ᾧ ἐρχομαι τὸ λεγόμενον· εἰ τις κακὸν βίον ἔχῃ μετὰ πίστεως ὀρθῆς. 'Tis manifest that St. Paul here speaks of works, and means the Man, whose Faith is right, but his Life is naught: Now, the Text thus understood is nothing to this Man's purpose, unless he can prove that the belief of the Trinity tends to make its professors more vicious than their opposers.

Theophyl.
& Chry-
sost. in lo-
cum.

But withal, by this wood, Hay, and stubble, may well be meant such and such Doctrines, as are not Orthodox: *Doctrina minus sincera, minusq; solida, velut si sit humanis, aut Philosophicis, aut etiam Judaicis opinionibus admixta plus satis, &c.* So one; and thus another: *Proprie ad mentem & scopum Apostoli, lignum, fœnum, stipula, est Doctrina incerta, frivola, pomposa, phalerata, curiosa, inutilis.* And so our own Divines: By wood, Hay, and stubble, St. Paul means, vain and curious subtilties, or Philosophical Conceits, all kind of teaching which serves to Ostentation, and not to Edification. Accordingly St. Hierom tells us, that the Persons here pointed at by St. Paul,

Estius in
locum.

Cornel. à
lap. in lo-
cum.

Engliſh
Annotati-
ons.

T

are

are *Magistri & Doctores*, such Preachers, as do, *pravè instituere*, teach their Flocks amiss, delivering such Doctrines, as are either *false* or *foolish*; and of these St. Paul saith, *They shall suffer loss*; if they be otherwise *vicious*, they shall have *no* reward; but if they be otherwise *virtuous*, and repent of their Errors, yet their Reward shall be so much the *less*.

Now, this Text doth this Man cite to prove this bold Assertion of his, *Doubtless the belief of a Trinity must needs much lessen the future happiness of pious and just Men*, as if by reason of this Faith of theirs they were in the Number of those Men, of whom St. Paul saith, *They shall suffer loss*; Their reward shall be diminished, and that barely, because they *believed* and *adored* the *Trinity*. This indeed is here very confidently avouched, but this Text can never make it good, unless it can first be proved that the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity* is, *wood*, *Hay*, or *Stubble*, *frivolous* or *erroneous*; for, if it be *true*, *weighty*, and *necessary*, as certainly it is, and hath been sufficiently proved to be so; we may venture to call it, as St. Paul here doth; *Gold*, *Silver*, *precious Stones*: for indeed the
Price

price of our Redemption depends upon
it.

But there is yet something worse behind; for, our Author goeth on thus: *In case Men of false Principles* (meaning us Trinitarians) *are told plainly that they are in the wrong, and yet they still do obstinately persist therein, and refuse to consider seriously the Arguments both of Scripture and Reason, that are offered (in his Book) to convince them, I see not how in any case 'tis possible for such to be saved: So he.*

The Summ of which amounts to thus much; that if we are not so far convinced by his Book. being designed by himself to end this Controversie, as to submit our own understandings to his better Judgment, and to renounce the Doctrine of the Trinity, in his opinion, we cannot possibly be saved; as if all his Arguments were infallible Demonstrations, and his sorry Pamphlet were the Canon of Faith.

But how comes this Man, who newly told us, that *Salvation and the belief of a Trinity are not inconsistent*, so quickly to damn so many of us? 'Tis because we are not convinced by his reasonings, because we give not

more credit to his *Book*, than to our *Bibles*; 'tis because we are not prevailed with by his *Authority*, to forsake that Established and Catholick Faith, which the strongest Arguments of all its opposers as yet could never shake. We are well assured that *Ignatius, Clemens, Irenaeus, Epiphanius, Basil, Tertullian, Cyprian*, and many more *Fathers, Confessors, and Martyrs* in succeeding Ages, were never removed from this Faith of theirs by all the *Pretextes* of *Ebion, Cerinthus, Arius, Sabellius, Eunomius, Photinus*, and other Hereticks; but they lived and died in the constant belief of the *Trinity*; and yet notwithstanding what this Man saith, we do not doubt, but these obstinate *Trinitarians* are very safely got to *Heaven*, and therefore not one whit the worse for being such.

Nor can this Man justly charge either the *ancient* or *modern* Defenders of the *Trinitarian* Doctrine, with any refusal to consider seriously the Arguments both from Scripture and Reason, that have been offered against it. Was not the whole Controversie maturely debated? were not the Scriptures on both sides examined? were not the Arguments of *Arius* duely weighed, and fairly

fairly answered by *Athanasius* in the Council of *Nice*? the Council of *Constantinople* condemned *Macedonius*; the Council of *Ephesus* condemned *Nestorius*; the Council of *Chalcedon* condemned *Eutyches*; and dare this Man so far charge these reverend Councils, as to say that they were rash in their determinations, and branded Men for Hereticks, without considering what they could say in defence of their opinions? did not *St. Basil*, and *Gregory Nysen*, first consider, duely examine, and then baffle the Arguments of *Eunomius*? did not *Tertullian* take the same course against *Praxeas*, and *St. Austin* against *Maximinus* an *Arian* Bishop; and other Hereticks? and do not our modern Divines use the same method still? for how can we answer *Socinian Arguments*, if we do not duely consider them first? and if we do, why doth this Man insinuate and suppose the contrary?

But since upon a strict Scrutiny, we find such Arguments to be but weak; since we find the *Scripture* to be abused, and wrested from its natural Sence; since we find humane Reason stretched beyond its just limits, employed about matters above its reach; nay, opposed even to *Divine Revelation*; since the

case stands thus, though we are not convinced by any *Socinian* Arguments yet produced against the *Trinity*; yet do we not by resisting them, as this Man saith, *Reject the Counsel of God, or do despite to the Spirit of Grace.*

And here I may take a fair occasion to retort this, or a like Argument upon this Man himself, and all others of his opinion, and tell them, If Men of false Principles, I mean our *Socinians*, will walk by a *dim* Candle of their own in defiance to the *clear Light* of God's glorious *Sun*; if they will set up their own *dark Reason*, in opposition to the perspicuous *Evidences* of *Divine Revelation*; if they will obstinately persist in an *Heretical* opinion, though the Scriptures and strong Arguments thence fairly deduced, are clearly against it; though I will not pass a *final* Sentence upon their future State; though I will not say of *them*, as this Man, in effect, doth of *us*, that 'tis impossible for them to be saved; yet say I will, that they are in great *danger of damnation.*

And this I take to be the Judgment of the *Catholick Church*; why else is that *Creed*, which bears the Name of *Athanasius*, received and owned as a
System

System of the true and undoubted Faith: This Creed, having first declared the Doctrine of the Trinity, and the Union of the Divine and Humane Natures in the Person of Christ, concludes thus, *This is the Catholick Faith; which except a Man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved*; which words import not only a danger, but a certainty of Damnation.

Doubtless *Athanasius* himself, or whosoever else compiled and collected this Creed out of his Writings, would never have passed so severe a Censure without a very good Ground, and a sufficient Warrant for it. And were that substance of this Creed any way *Heterodox* and Erroneous, or were its dreadful *Epiphonema*, and concluding Sentence rash and groundless; we cannot imagine that the *Christian Church*, from Age to Age should, not only embrace it, but insert it into her *Liturgies*, command all her Ministers to subscribe it, and to proclaim it often in our publick Congregations, thereby requiring every Man's assent unto it.

Nor is this done without very good Reason; for our Lord himself hath said, *He that believes not, shall be damned*. Mar. 16. 16 This Sentence is very plain and

case stands thus, though we are not convinced by any *Socinian* Arguments yet produced against the *Trinity*; yet do we not by resisting them, as this Man saith, *Reject the Counsel of God, or do despite to the Spirit of Grace.*

And here I may take a fair occasion to retort this, or a like Argument upon this Man himself, and all others of his opinion, and tell them, If Men of false Principles, I mean our *Socinians*, will walk by a *dim Candle* of their own in defiance to the *clear Light* of God's glorious *Sun*; if they will set up their own *dark Reason*, in opposition to the perspicuous *Evidences* of *Divine Revelation*; if they will obstinately persist in an *Heretical* opinion, though the *Scriptures* and strong Arguments thence fairly deduced, are clearly against it; though I will not pass a *final* Sentence upon their future State; though I will not say of *them*, as this Man, in effect, doth of *us*, that 'tis impossible for them to be saved; yet say I will, that they are in great *danger* of *damnation*.

And this I take to be the Judgment of the *Catholick Church*; why else is that *Creed*, which bears the Name of *Athanasius*, received and owned as a
System

System of the true and undoubted Faith: This *Creed*, having first declared the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and the *Union* of the *Divine* and *Humane* Natures in the Person of Christ, concludes thus, *This is the Catholick Faith; which except a Man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved*; which words import not only a danger, but a certainty of Damnation.

Doubtless *Athanasius* himself, or whosoever else compiled and collected this *Creed* out of his Writings, would never have passed so severe a *Censure* without a very good Ground, and a sufficient Warrant for it. And were that substance of this *Creed* any way *Heterodox* and *Erroneous*, or were its dreadful *Epiphonema*, and concluding Sentence *rash* and groundless; we cannot imagine that the *Christian Church*, from Age to Age should, not only embrace it, but insert it into her *Liturgies*, command all her Ministers to subscribe it, and to proclaim it often in our publick Congregations, thereby requiring every Man's assent unto it.

Nor is this done without very good Reason; for our Lord himself hath said, *He that believes not, shall be damned*; This Sentence is very plain and

Mar. 16. 16

positive; and 'tis pronounced by the great Judge of Men and Angels, from whom there is no appeal; the only question is, what are those Objects of Faith, whereunto we must give our assent, or else be *damned*? Doubtless, 'tis not the *whole History* recorded by *Moses* and the *Prophets*; nor is it every truth delivered by our *Evangelists* and *Apostles*; there are in both our Testaments several things, whereof a Man may be ignorant without any hazard of his Salvation. But those Doctrines, which are absolutely *necessary* to be believed in order to it, are the *Prime Fundamental Articles* of our *Creed*; amongst which the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity* is One, and a very great One too. For,

i. The main Foundation of our Christian Faith is this; *That our blessed Saviour hath fully satisfied the Divine Justice for the Sin of the world*: For, if this be not so, then is every Man left to satisfy for *himself*, which yet no Man can ever do, and consequently all Men without our Lord's satisfaction must perish for ever.

Now, if the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity* were not true, no such *satisfaction* could be supposed: For, if the re
be

be but *one* Person in the Godhead, as this Man dreams, then our blessed Saviour is not God; and if he be not God, then could he not satisfie the demands of an offended and *Infinite* Justice for the Sin of Man,

But that our Lord hath fully *satisfied* the Divine *Justice* is the firm Belief of the Catholick Church, and 'tis grounded upon several Texts. 'Tis said, *He* Heb. 9.12. *hath obtained eternal Redemption for us*; but how did he do it? did it cost him nothing? St. Paul answers, *We are* 1Cor. 6.20. *bought with a Price*; we are *bought*, there's the *Purchase*; with a *Price*, there's the *Consideration* paid. And what this *Price* was, the same Apostle elsewhere tells us, *God hath pur-* Act. 20.28. *chased his Church with his own Blood*; and our Lord himself saith, *The Son of* Mat. 20.28 *Man hath given his life a ransom for many*. Certainly these Terms of *buying, purchasing, redeeming, and ransoming*, must needs imply a sufficient *satisfaction* offered, accepted, and paid.

Now, to say, as this Man doth, that all these expressions are *improper* and figurative, is, not only to contradict the general Judgment of the Catholick Church, but even to elude the *Scriptures*, and force them to say, what-
ever

ever Men think fit to countenance an ill opinion, and barely to serve a turn.

But by vertue of these, and many more Texts, we stand obliged to believe that our Lord hath indeed completely *satisfied* the Infinite *Justice* of his offended Father, and the doing thereof must needs prove him God; for 'tis impossible that the Blood of any *mere* Man could do it. And this is enough to prove, that there are at least *Two* Persons in the Godhead, the one *satisfied*, the other *satisfying*. And this I take to be a *fundamental* point of our Religion, the belief whereof is necessary to our Salvation.

2. 'Tis a fundamental point of our Religion, to believe that our Blessed Saviour ought to be Religiously worshipped, and adored.

For our Lord himself hath told us,

John 5.23. *That all men should honour the Son, as they honour the Father, as I have proved in a former Section, with equal honour.*

Luk. 24.52 *The Apostles did so, They worshipped him, and so do glorified Saints and Angels in Heaven.*

Apoc. 3.13. *Blessing, Honour, Glory, and Power, be unto him that sits upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever, and ever: And this was no more than God the Father had commanded; when he*

he bringeth the first begotten into the ^{Heb. 1. 6.} world, he saith, *And let all the Angels of God worship him*; and surely, if the whole *Hierarchy* of Heaven are commanded to worship our Lord, the whole *Race* of Men are much more obliged to do so too.

And certainly this *religious* Worship and Divine Honour, which is, and ought to be, done to Christ, is enough to prove his *Godhead*; for, the Command runs thus; *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* ^{Mat. 4. 10.} Now, since we are forbid to worship any *Creature*, and yet commanded to worship *Christ*; 'tis plain, that he is more than a *Creature*; but that he cannot be, if he be not *God*.

The belief of this, and a religious Practice suitable to such a Faith, seems absolutely necessary to Man's Salvation; for, our Lord hath said, *If ye believe not that I am He, ye shall die in your Sins*; what *He* doth he mean? certainly the very same, whom the Scriptures report him to be; and what say they concerning him? *The word* ^{John 1. 1.} *was God*; *This is the true God, the* ^{Job. 5. 20.} *mighty God, the everlasting Father, God blessed for ever.* *Thy Throne, O God,* ^{Isa. 9. 6.} *is for ever, and ever.* Now, *If ye believe*

Rom. 9. 5.
Heb. 1. 8.

lieve not, that I am such an He, as these Texts import, ye shall die in your Sins.

But if we shall leave out this pronoun *He*, which our Translatours thought fit to supply; and render the Text exactly according to it's Original, the Sence will be the same, and the words must run thus: *If ye believe not, ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, That I am.* Now, since this Title, *I am*, is peculiar to God, 'tis as if our Lord had said, *If ye believe not that I am God, ye shall die in your Sins*: And if so, what is like to become of our *Socinians*, who deny the Divinity of Christ, and refuse to give our Lord that religious Worship and Adoration, which he deserves, expects, and most justly claims? For they, who in this Sence, deny our Lord, *before Men*, have great cause to fear, that our Lord, *may deny them before the Angels of God.*

Mat. 23. 38.

3. 'Tis a fundamental point of our Religion to believe, that the *Holy Ghost* is *God*, and consequently, that he ought to be religiously worshiped and adored.

This we learn from several Texts; that, which contains our Saviour's Form of Baptism is one, *Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son,*

Mat. 28. 19

Son,

Son, and of the Holy Ghost: That of St. John is another; *There are Three that* ^{1 John 5. 7.} *bear record in Heaven; the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One: That of St. Paul is a third; The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and* ^{2 Cor. 13.} *the love of God, and the communion of* ^{14.} *the Holy Ghost, be with you all.* In these and other Texts, the Holy Ghost is mentioned as a Person distinct from the Father, and the Son, but joined with both as one of the same Rank, Power, and Authority with them. And because he is indeed in all Respects of equal Dignity with them, St. Peter ^{Acts 5. 4.} gave him the same high Title, and plainly stiled him God.

And upon the account of his Godhead, St. Paul thought fit to leave us these necessary Cautions, *Grieve not* ^{Eph. 4. 30.} *the Holy Spirit, and again, Quench not* ^{1 Thes. 5. 19} *the Spirit; and for the same reason doth he tell us, that it is a most dangerous thing, To do despite to the Spirit of Grace; Heb. 10. 29. so dangerous it is to sin highly against this blessed Spirit, that our Lord himself hath told us; *whosoever speaketh* ^{Matt. 12.} *against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him; but why should this Sin be* ^{31, 32.} *unpardonable, rather than any Sin besides, if the Holy Ghost be not God? And*
if*

if he be so, 'tis necessary to our Salvation, that we own and *worship* him as such, lest otherwise we contract upon our selves the guilt of that Sin, which is *irremissible*.

SECT. XXXI.

AND how this Socinian Authour can acquit himself from all *Degrees* of this unpardonable Sin, I cannot tell; for, though he doth not *blaspheme* this blessed Spirit at the same rate, as the *Jews* once did; yet he *designs*, attempts, and doth whatever he can, to disprove his *Personality*, as if he were no more than a *Quality*, or Power of God the Father, but not a Divine and distinct *Being* subsisting by himself. For with a world of confidence he tells us thus; 'Tis plain from the general *Analogy* of true Faith, grounded on Scripture evidence, that the Holy Ghost is no distinct Person subsisting of himself: So he.

But if this indeed be so plainly delivered in the Word of God; how comes it to pass, that such vast Numbers of judicious, learned, and pious Men,

Men, well versed in the Holy Scriptures, could never yet see it there? well, to inform us better, and to convince us of this pretended Truth, tho' it be a real *Heresie*, he urgeth this sorry Argument. *If the Holy Ghost be a distinct Person, then 'tis clear that our Lord could not be the Son of him, who is now called God the Father, since 'tis plain that the Virgin Mary's conception was occasioned by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost.* To which I answer thus;

1. Our Lord, in respect of his *Divine Nature*, is the Son of the *first Person* only; and that Person alone, upon that account, is often called, *the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. And our Lord himself, upon the same ground only is properly stiled sometimes, *the begotten*, and sometimes, *the only begotten Son of God*; a Title, which cannot fairly belong to him in respect of his *Manhood*.

2. Our Lord, in regard of his *Humane Nature*, may not unfitly be called the Son of the whole *Trinity*; the *first Person* contriving his Incarnation, the *second* freely consenting to it, and the *third* effecting it; and this doth rather prove than hinder the distinction of their Persons.

And

And now let us try the strength of this Man's Argument; *The Holy Ghost*, saith he, *is not a distinct Person in the supposed Trinity*, but why not? his Reason is this: *Our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost is styled the Son of the first Person, or God the Father; and if so, it should seem that God the Father, and the Holy Ghost, are not personally distinguished; That's the Substance of his Argument: To which I thus reply;*

1. Our Lord was the Son of the first Person, long before his Conception of the *Holy Ghost*.

Athan. in
Ep. ad E-
pict. p. 583.

Accordingly *Athanasius* styles him, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς*, and again, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, the Son of God before *Mary's* time, the Son of his substance, his natural Son, even by an eternal Generation; a Generation sure, but inexplicable. For, as *St. Austin* demands, *Quis enarrabit, quomodo natus sit Deus de Deo, nec Deorum numerus creverit?* Who can declare how a God was born of a God, and yet the Number of Gods not increased? but that so it is, this great Man took for granted: For, preaching upon a *Christmas Day*, he told his Hearers thus: *Hac die est natus ex Vir-*
gine

August. de
nat. Dom.
Ser. 8. T.
10. p. 128.

August. de
nat. Dom.
Ser. 18. T.
10. p. 133.

*gine Matre, qui ante secula aternus est
genitus ex Deo Patre.* This Day was
he born of the *Virgin* his Mother, who
was begotten of God his Father before
all Ages, even from Eternity. So
then, our Lord, upon this account,
may very well be called, for doubt-
less he is, the Son of the *first* Person;
and yet this *first* Person may be, and
is, distinguished from the *third*, be-
cause in this *Eternal Generation* of the
Son, the *Holy Ghost* was no way con-
cerned. But,

2. We grant that our Lord, as be-
ing in his *humane* Nature conceived
by the *Holy Ghost*, was to be called, as
the *Angel* told his Mother, the *Son*
of God, but how this proves, that God
the Father, and the *Holy Ghost*, are not
Personally distinguished, I cannot tell.

For, the *Angel* doth not say, *He*
shall be called the Son of God the Fa-
ther, the first Person only, excluding
the *second* and the *third*. Nor may
we here restrain the Name of God to
the *first* Person only; for our Lord, the
second *Adam*, as well as the first, was
the Son of God by *Creation*; a Work,
wherein the *whole Trinity* had an equal
hand. And whereas the *Creation* of
our Lord's *humane* Nature is here par-

ticularly ascribed to the *Holy Ghost*, and whereas 'tis said, *Therefore that holy thing shall be called the Son of God*, the most genuine and natural inference, which can thence be raised, is this, namely, that *the Holy Ghost is God*.

But this our Socinian denieth, and tells us, 'Tis evident from these additional words, And the Power of the highest shall overshadow thee, *that the Holy Ghost is only that Divine and Invisible Power of God, by which he works his will and pleasure in the world; and by consequence, that God and the Spirit of God are no more two distinct Persons, than man and the spirit of man are*; so he. I answer,

This Speech of the *Angel* contains two things: 1. The *Person*, who was designed to be the *immediate Author*, and efficient Cause of this miraculous Conception; namely, the *Holy Ghost*. 2. The *Instrumental means*, whereby this wonderful Work was to be wrought; namely, the *Power of the highest*, the Omnipotence of God. And if this distinction be allowed, then did the *Angel* speak like himself, but otherwise not; for, if by the *Holy Ghost*, and the *Power of the highest*, the *Angel* means but one and the same thing,

then

then here's an *Instrument* mention'd, but no *Agent* to use it; here's a *Work* to be done, but no *Authour* to do it; here's a *Son* to be conceived and born of a *Virgin*, but none to supply the place of a *Father*.

But, to gratifie this Authour, let us suppose that the *Holy Ghost* is here called, *the Power of the highest*; yet now will this Title prove that he is indeed no *Person*; St. Paul stiles our blessed Saviour, *the Power of God*, which is all one with the *Power of the highest*. And dares this Man take occasion from this *Character*, to say that our Lord is no *Person*, but a meer *quality* only? if not, if this Title, which St. Paul ascribes unto *Christ*, do not disprove his *Personality* and distinction from his Father; why should the same Title, being ascribed by an *Angel* to the *Holy Ghost*, disprove his?

And whereas this Man boldly saith, That God and the Spirit of God are no more two distinct Persons, than Man and the Spirit of Man are; I answer, the Man and the Spirit of Man cannot be two distinct Persons, because Man without his Spirit cannot be so much as *One*; but 'tis not so with God. Now, to shew the Falshood of this

Man's assertion, I shall prove these two things; 1. That the blessed *Spirit* of God is indeed a *Person*. 2. That he is a *Person distinct*, both from the Father and the Son.

1. That the blessed *Spirit* of God is indeed a *Real Person*; and such an one Ravanelius is thus defined, *substantia individua & singularis, intelligens, incommunicabilis, non pars alterius, nec ab alio sustentata,*

Aquin. qu.
29. Art. 1.

so one; and thus another, Persona est rationalis naturæ individua substantia.

In short, a *Person* is an *intelligent, individual, and distinct subsistence*, *ὑποστασις*; or, as some would rather express it, *ὑπόστασις*; so Gregory Nazianzen tells us. Now, that the blessed *Spirit* of God is indeed such a *Person*, I shall prove two ways; 1. By the *Testimonies* of pious, learned, and judicious Men, who are *ἁγιοί*, such as well deserve to be believed. 2. By the *Authority* of sacred *writ*, which is the *Infallible Testimony of God*.

1. That the blessed *Spirit* of God is indeed a *Real Person*, we have *ἡ μαρτυρία* Heb. 12. 1. *μαρτύρων, a Cloud of witnesses*, such a multitude of such *Witnesses*, that about this matter, no humane *Testimony* can be greater; nay, none can match it.

I know,

I know, that to invalidate this Argument from the *Authority of Men*, a late *Socinian* Book in its Title Page, tells us, *Non quis, sed quid*; we are to consider, not *who* speaks or writes, but *what* is spoke or written; and therein the Authour of that Tract, and we are agreed. But withal, have we not reason to believe, that the Defenders of the *Trinity* in all Ages did seriously consider, *Quid*, what they *said*, and what they *wrote*, especially about a matter of so great Concern? Can we charitably judge that so many Men of such excellent *Parts*, such exemplary *Piety*, such acute *Judgments*, who made it their business to examine the Scriptures, to compare Text with Text, that they might surely find out the Truth, should be *rash* in their Determinations, and recommend this Doctrine, as a necessary Article of Faith, to the whole Christian Church, had they not found in their Bibles a sufficient warrant for it? Can we think that without any certain grounds, they themselves would have professed the Faith of the Trinity, lived and died in that profession; yea, and condemned for a Pack of *Hereticks*, all those who did any way oppose it? certainly, if

A Letter to
the Re-
vend Cler.
gv of both
the Uni-
versities.

there be any Validity in the *Testimony* of *Man*, there is as much as can be expected in any Mortal, in the *Testimony* of the *Primitive Councils*, and *Ancient Fathers*, who were prudent, learned, judicious, and pious Persons ; and therefore witnesses even beyond all just Exception.

Thus much being premised, let us consider what these Men of great renown in the Church of God have thought, done, and writ in reference to the *three Persons* in the *Deity*, of whom the blessed *Spirit* is one.

Epiphan.
Hær. 69.
Sect. 52.
p. 774.

Epiphanius tells us, that the *Divine Personality* of the *Holy Ghost* was denied by the *Arians*, Περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος βλα-

φημεῖς, καὶ ὁρμηῖς λέγειν κατὰ τὸ ἴδιον ὅτι ὁ υἱός. They speak blasphemous Words against the *Spirit*, and dare to say that he was created by the Son.

Basil. M.
adv. Eunom. 1, 2.
p. 76.

Of the same opinion was *Eunomius*, who affirmed, τὸ ἀγνώστου καὶ ὁὐκ ὄντος ποίημα, ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὁ ἀφ' οὐκ ὄντος. That the Son was the Workmanship of the *unbegotten*, and that the *Paraclete*, i.e. the *Holy Ghost*, was the Workmanship of the Son.

August. de
hær. Hær.
49. Tom. 1.
p. 6.

St. *Augustin* expresseth thus ; *spiritum sanctum Creaturam Creaturæ, hoc est, ab ipso Filio creatum volunt* : They would have the

Holy

Holy Ghost to be the Creature of a Creature, to be created by the Son himself.

But how did the learned Men of those times resent these opinions, and those that held them? 'Tis well known; and the Historian tells us, that the Council of *Nice*, Ἀρειον καὶ τὰς ὁμοδόξους αὐτοῦ *Socr. Hist.*
ἐκθρομάτισαν ἅπαντας, did excommunicate *Ecc. l. i.*
Arius, and all others of his opinion, c. 8. p. 23.
as so many *Hereticks*. This Council consisted of 318 Bishops, who compiled and approved that *Creed*, of which that famous Emperour *Constantine* the Great wrote thus, Οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἕτερον
ἢ τὸ Θεοῦ γνώμη, 'Tis nothing else but the mind of God: And for that he gave this reason; τὸ Ἅγιον πνεῦμα τοιοῦτον καὶ τιλικύτων ἀνδρῶν καὶ διανοίας ἐγκείμενον, τὴν θεῖαν βέλησαν ἐξεφώλιον. *Id. p. 31.*
The *Holy Ghost* influencing the Understandings of so many and such excellent Persons, revealed his *Divine* will and pleasure to them.

Nor was this Council rash in their Determinations; for, saith the Historian, ἐπερωτήσεις καὶ ἀποκρίσεις ἀνέκωνοντο. *Id. p. 25.*
Questions were moved, and *Answers* were given over and over; and again, ἐξητάθη τὰ καὶ τὰ ἀσέβεια, καὶ τὰ ὁρρονομία. *Id. p. 27.*
Arius that persecuted *Βασιλέως Κωνσταντίνου*.

The wicked opinion of *Arius* was thoroughly examined and debated in the Presence of the Emperour himself, who so well approved the Decrees of the Council, that by a Letter of his own he recommended them to his Subjects, and required them to acquiesce in them.

And as the Acts of the *Nicene Council* were approved and commended by the good Emperour, who heard the matters before them fairly debated; so were they afterwards confirmed and ratified by the *second General Council*, consisting of an 150 Bishops, who were convened at *Constantinople*, by the Command of *Theodosius*. And to what end they were summoned together, we

Socr. Hist.

Eccl. l. 7.

c. 7. p. 711.

Socr. Hist.

Eccl. l. 5.

c. 8. p. 264.

Conc. Con-

stantinop.

Canon. 1.

learn from *Socrumen*; Βεβαιώτην ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἐν Νικαίᾳ δοξαντῶν; or, as *Socrates* words it; Πρὸς τὸ κερταίνειν τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίσιν; To confirm the *Nicene Faith*. And accordingly they did so, for their first Canon tells us, ὡς οὐ μὴ ἀφαιρῶν τὴν πίσιν τῶν πατέρων τῶν τετρακοσίων δεκάοκτώ τῇ ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνελθόντων, ἀλλὰ μένειν αὐτὴν κυρίαν, καὶ ἀνασχυραπιδύναται πᾶσαν αἵρεσιν. They decreed that the Faith of the *Nicene Fathers* should not be abrogated, but remain firm, and that every *Heretic* should

should be condemned; and particularly, τ̃ πνευμαζομένων, that of the *Eunomians*, *Eudoxians*, and others, whom the *Canon* names, as Enemies to the *Divinity* of the *Holy Ghost*; of which this Council was so satisfied, that in opposition to the *Macedonian Heresie*, they thought fit to enlarge that Article of the *Nicene Creed*, which relates to the *Holy Ghost*; and to assert his *Divinity*, they added some Clauses to it; and made it run thus, π̃εύω εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ κύριον καὶ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύμενον, τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συναρροσυνόμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαι διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. I believe in the *Holy Ghost*, the Lord and giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who together with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the Prophets. Doubtless, the addition of these words to the *Nicene Creed*, is a clear Evidence that this Council did firmly believe the *Divine Personality* of the *Holy Ghost*.

But if these words, as some learned Men have thought, were put into this *Creed* originally by the *Nicene Fathers* themselves; yet since this Council of *Constantinople* did own and confirm all the

Jacobus
Ufferius
Armachanus de
Symbolis,
p. 17.

the Articles of that *Creed*, our Argument from their Authority holds as strong, as if they themselves had composed the whole *Creed*, or enlarged it. And the same Argument may be pleaded from the Authority of the *Third Oecumenical Council*, that of *Ephesus*, consisting of 200 Bishops, convened by *Theodosius* the second against the *Heretic* of *Nestorius*. Of which Council 'tis

Council. E.
phes. Can. 7

thus recorded, ὡρισαν ἡ ἀγία σύνοδος ἐπίσταν πῖσιν μηδεν ἐξείναι προσφέρειν ἢ συνιστάειν ἢ συνιέναι, ὡδὲ τὸ δευτέρῳ ὡδὲ τῷ ἀγίων πατέρων τῷ ἐν τῇ Νικαίων πόλει συναχθέντων, σὺν ἀγίῳ πνεύματι, &c. in effect, the Bishops, there assembled, decreed that no Man should offer, compose, and write any other System of Faith, besides that of the *Nicene Council*. And yet further, the

Pandectz
Can. &
Council.
Græc. T. 1.
p. 103.
Patrick
Sympson's
History of
the Church,
p. 509.

Constitutions of these three forenamed Councils were approved and ratified by a fourth, that of *Chalcedon* consisting of 630 Bishops and Reverend Fathers, convened by *Martianus* against the *Heretic* of *Eutyches*. Their first *Canon* is this, τὰς ὡδὲ ἀγίων πατέρων καὶ ἐκείνης συνόδου ἄξει τὸν ὑπαγεῖντας κανόνας κρατεῖν ἐδικαιώσαιμεν; we think fit that the Canons, which have been declared and approved in every one of the

the

the foregoing Councils should be still observed and kept in force.

Now, the Divine *Personality* of the *Holy Ghost*, being thus attested and asserted by these four General Councils, by the joint Suffrages of so many hundred learned and pious Divines met together, who seriously consulted the Scriptures about this matter; we need the fewer Testimonies of single Persons to prove the same Truth. That of *Eriphanius*, Bishop of *Cyprus*, shall be one; Οὐκ ἄλλοτερον πατρός καὶ υἱῆς, ἀλλὰ ἐκ τῆ αὐτῆς ὑστάς, ἐκ τῆ αὐτῆς Θεότητι, ἐκ πατρός καὶ υἱῆς, σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ, ἐν ὑπόστασιν ἀεὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον; and again he saith of the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, that they are ἀληθῶς τέλεια Id. ibid. καὶ ὀνόματα, τέλειαι αἱ ὑποστάσεις, truly perfect Names, and truly perfect Persons. *Gregory Nazianzen*, surnamed Θεολόγος, the Eminent Divine, speaking of God, saith that he is Ἐν τῇ ὁσίᾳ, καὶ ἡ τέλει ἡ ὑπόστασις, One in Essence, Three in Persons, Baptism being administered in the Name of the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*: *Gregory Nyssen* styles it Μυστήριον τῶν τετῶν ὑποστάσεων; Greg. Nyss. in Bapt. Christi, p. 804. The Mystery of the Three Persons. *Theophylact* speaking of the same Sacrament, saith τετῶν προσώπων ἐμνήσθη Κύριος; Theoph. in Matth. cap. 28. v. 18.

Cyrl. Hier.
Cat. 16.
p. 176.

Elias Cret.
in Naz.
Or. 1. p. 83.

ⲉⲙⲟⲩ ; Our Lord did therein make mention of three *Persons*, of which the *Holy Spirit* must be one ; and that so he is indeed, St. *Cyril of Jerusalem* proves by this Argument, *ὅτι γὰρ, ὁ λογικὸν ἔστι.* The *Spirit* must needs be a Person, because he is a *living* and *intelligent* Being. And, to name no more, *Elias Cretensis* writes thus of the *Holy Ghost*: *Spiritus est essentia, quæ per se in peculiari Hypostasi consideratur,* the *Spirit* is an *Essence* considered in a subsistence peculiar to himself. And to the same purpose might abundance of more *Authorities* be transcribed out of the *Greek* and *Latin Fathers*, and many other *Christian Writers*, who with one consent own and assert the blessed *Spirit* to be, not a *Quality*, nor the *Power* of God the *Father*, as our *Socinians* dream, but a *real Person* subsisting by himself.

Basil. M.
adv. Eunod.
L. 1. p. 5.

But, as to this present Argument drawn from *humane Authority*, if any of our modern *Socinians* shall say to us, as one of their *Predecessours* did, in a like case, to Great St. *Basil*: *Αἰτῶμαι πρὸ πάντων ὑμᾶς, μὴ τὰς πλῆθὺς διακρίνειν ἐθέλειν τὴν ἀληθείας τὸ ψεῦδος, τῇ πλείονι μείρα τὸ χρεῖττον σιωπῶντας, μήτε μὴν ἀξιώμασι προσέχον τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τὴν διά-*

νοίαν

νοίαν, ἢ τῇ τάξει τῆς περιλαβόντων ἢ πλε-
 ὄν νέμοντάς, σκοπεῖν τὰς ἀκούας τοῖς
 ὑστέροις: We desire you in the first
 place, that you will not judge and de-
 termine concerning *Truth* or *Falshood*
 by the *Multitude* of Voices; that you
 will not conclude that side to be in
 the right, which hath the *greater Num-*
ber; that you will not so far respect
 the *Dignity* of *Persons*, as to prepossess
 your Judgment with prejudice; that
 you will not attribute so much to the
 Constitutions and *Decrees* of former
 Ages, as to slight and stop the Ears a-
 gainst the Proposals and Sentiments of
 later Authors.

To this I shall return the same An-
 swer, which St. Basil did; τί λέγεις,
 μὴ νείμωμεν τὸ πλεον τοῖς περιλαβού-
 σιν; αἰδεσθῶμεν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν τε νῦν ὄντων
 χριστιανῶν, καὶ τῶν ὅσοι γεγονόσιν ἀφ' ἧς
 κατηγήλην τὸ εὐαγγέλιον; μὴ λογιώμεθα
 τὸ ἀξίωμα τῶν ἐν παντοίοις κατεστας
 διαφανέντων πατριάρχαις, &c. What do
 these Men say? may we not shew a
 more than ordinary respect to the *An-*
cient Fathers? may we pay no reve-
 rence to the *Multitude* of Christians,
 which now are, and have always been
 ever since the Gospel was preached?
 may we not highly value the Judgment
 of

of those Persons, who were apparently blest with variety of *spiritual Gifts* and *Graces*?

We cannot well deny that those early Christians, who lived nearest to the Apostle's time, had the fairest opportunity to acquaint themselves with the *Doctrines*, which they delivered, amongst which the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity* was One; so saith *Irenaeus*,

Iren. adv.
Hær. l. 1.
c. 2.

Ἡ ἐκκλησία, κατέχευε καὶ ὅλης τῆς οὐρανίας διδασκαλίας, ὡς καὶ τὸ Ἄποστολικὸν καὶ ἐκείνων μαθητῶν ὡς λαβῆσα ἡ εἰς ἓν Θεὸν πατέρα, καὶ εἰς ἓνα υἱόν, καὶ εἰς πνεῦμα ἅγιον, κρίνῃ, &c. The Church, tho' dispersed throughout the World, received from the Apostles and their Disciples Faith in one God the *Father*, and in one *Christ*, and in the *Holy Ghost*. Now, since this *Apostolical Doctrine* was generally owned by the *Primitive Christians*, ratified by several *Councils*, defended by *learned* and pious *Confessors* and *Martyrs*, and in despite of all its Opposers, transmitted to *Posterity* from Age to Age, I think, no *humane Testimony* of its Truth can be greater.

It's true, some learned Men, tho' comparatively but a few, have vigorously opposed this *Doctrine*; and who they were, and why they did so. *St. Austin* thus

August. de
Trin. l. 1.
c. 10. T. 3.
p. 54.

thus

thus informs us. *Immature & perverso rationis amore falluntur. Quorum nonnulli ea, quæ de corporalibus rebus, sive per sensus corporeos experta noverunt; sive quæ natura humani ingenii & diligentia vivacitate, vel artis adjutorio perceperunt, ad res incorporeas & spirituales transferre conantes, ut ex his illa metiri atque opinari velint*: The sum of which words is this; Men doat too much upon their own crude and obstinate Reason, they measure spiritual things by things corporeal, matters of faith by matters of sense, from visible objects they raise inferences about things invisible, and the doing of that deceives them.

And thus do our modern Socinians argue against the Doctrine of the Trinity, by finite and corporeal Beings, they measure Beings infinite and incorporeal; and because the humane Nature subsisting in three distinct Persons, constitutes three Men; and the Angelical Nature subsisting in three distinct Subjects, doth make three Angels: They hence conclude, that if the Divine Nature doth equally subsist in Three distinct Persons, there must needs be three Gods. But doth the Nature of Men, Angels, and God, fall under the same considerations? the Nature of Men and Angels

Angels being *finite* and limited, when 'tis communicated to three several Subjects, doth make three Men or three Angels *specifically* the same; but the *Divine Nature*, which is *infinite* and *indivisible*, being entirely communicated to *three* distinct Persons, cannot make *Three Gods*, but *One God numerically* the same. But how *one* and the same *numerical Nature* should equally subsist in three distinct Persons, how each of the *Three* should be God, and yet God be but *One*, is a difficulty very hard to be explained. But in matters of this kind, we must submit *humane Reason* to *Divine Revelation*; and sure I am, if no *Trinitarian* were able to return a satisfactory Answer to those *Arguments*, which our *Socinians* urge against the *Trinity*; yet no *Socinian* as yet ever did, nor, I think, ever can fairly answer those *Texts*, which we plead for it. And if so, whether we ought to give more credit to the *fallible Reasonings* of Men, than to the *infallible word* of God, let every impartial Reader judge.

And judge he may with the greater ease, because, so far as *humane Testimony* is of any value in our present case, we have the *fairest* on our side; for the

De

Defenders of the *Trinity* are, to speak modestly, Persons at least of *equal weight* with their opposers; and to be sure, they are far, very far the *greater Number*; I think, an hundred for one; and our hundred have been as much concerned, as their one could be, not to commit the Sin of Idolatry by worshiping any Person, who is not truly God.

It's true, in those early Ages, where in this dispute concerning the *Divinity* of *Christ*, and his *Holy Spirit* was first raised, and by degrees began to grow, the Defenders of this Doctrine could have no humane Authority to give it countenance; but they then had, and we still have far better Evidences to prove it. For, we do not depend upon the *Testimonies* of *Men* any farther, than as they are well bottomed upon the sacred *Word* of God, which, in this case especially, is to us the *only* rule and ground of Faith. But since we think that the *Ancient Fathers*, who were learned and pious Men, chiefly when met in Councils; were very able to apprehend, and very conscientious to declare the true meaning of the Holy Scriptures; and since the generality of succeeding *Divines* in after Ages, have

approv'd the Judgment of the four first *Oecumenical* Councils, and many other excellent Writers; we cannot be persuaded by all the pretences of humane Reason, to alter our opinion about the sense of those many Texts, which have been judged by such vast Numbers of such incomparable Persons, so plainly to assert the *Deity* of *Christ*, and the *Holy Ghost*. And the rather, because those *other Interpretations*, which the opposers of this Doctrine do even force upon those Texts, which make against them, are so *impertinent*, wild, absurd, and indeed intolerable, that, were it not to serve a turn, they could never be owned by those *Socinians*, who esteem themselves such great *masters* of *Sence* and *Reason*.

Did a *figurative* interpretation of several plain Passages in the Writings of *St. John*, and *St. Paul* tend to overthrow the *Socinian* Hypothesis, they might as *justly* abhor the thoughts of any *Tropes* in those Speeches of the Evangelist and Apostle, as the *Roman* Catholicks *unjustly* do in those words of Christ: *This is my Body, This is my Blood*.

But to forbear the further pursuit of this Digression. To shew what Scripture evidences we have for the Di-
vine

vine *Personality* of the Holy Ghost, the proof whereof is my present design, will be the business of my next particular, and the Subject matter of my last Section.

SECT. XXXII.

1. **T**Hat the *Holy Spirit* is indeed a *Divine Person* is very evident from the Authority of the Scripture, which being rightly understood, is the Testimony of God; and therefore, tho' it deliver some things above the reach of humane Understandings; yet since 'tis infallible, we stand obliged to believe it's Truth. Now, our Evidences thence are these:

1. The Scriptures do once and again *connumerate* and conjoin the *Holy Spirit* with God the Father, and God the Son.

So doth our blessed Saviour himself in his Form of Baptism, *Baptize them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; here we have a clear distinction of three glorious Subsistences in the *Godhead*, who are mention'd as Persons of the same Order, Dignity, and equal Objects of

Divine Worship; for why else did our Lord unite them in this solemn and sacred Institution?

- St. Basil mentions some Hereticks, who made bold to say, Οὐ κατὰ πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν σὺν πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ, διὰ τὸ τὸ φύσιν ἑτεροῦς, καὶ τὸ τὸ ἀξίας κατὰ δέξιν. That the holy Spirit ought not to be ranked with the Father, and the Son, as being, in their opinion, of a different Nature, and lower Dignity.
- Basil. M. de Sp. S. c. 10. p. 166. Their thought was Μη συναρῶμεθα ἀλλ' ὑπαρῶμεθα, that the Holy Spirit should be reckoned, not together with the Father, and the Son, but under both. But saith St. Basil, Οὐχὶ τῇ τῷ Θεῷ διαταγῇ παρ' ἡμῶς ἀνέστην; do not these Men manifestly oppose the Command of God? hath not our Lord charged us to join them all three together in the use of this Holy Sacrament? and what may we thence infer? doubtless the Equality of the Holy Ghost, with the Father, and the Son; for, as the same
- Id. cap. 17. p. 186. Father observes, τοῖς ὁμοτέμοις ἀρῶμεν τὴν συναρῶμεθα τοῖς ὅτι κατὰ τὸ χεῖρον περιλαμβανόμενοι ὑπαρῶμεθα. It becomes Persons of the same Honour to be ranked together, but Men of inferior Note to be placed below them.

Tertullian indeed stiles the Holy Spirit, *Tertius Majestatis gradus*: But he did not mean, that there is any *Inequality* betwixt the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, in point of *Dignity*; but where three Persons are named together, there must be a *first*, a *second*, and a *third*; but such a distinct enumeration doth necessarily import a *priority* and *posteriority*, not of *excellence*, but of *order* only. Accordingly doth *Gregory Nazianzen* thus affirm, Tert. adv. Prax. p. 552
 τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ πατὴρς ἔστις ὁμοούσιον ἔστι δὲ
 ὁμοτιμον. The Spirit is of the self same Greg. Naz. Or. 20. p. 365.
substance and equal Honour with the *Father*, and the *Son*.

And this *Equality* of these three glorious Persons, did the Ancients partly gather from their conjunction in this Form of Baptism; so did the same *Father*, Naz. Or. 32. p. 521.
 πιστεύομεν εἰς πατέρα, ἔστι υἱόν, ἔστι
 πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ὁμοούσια τε ἔστι ὁμωδόξα: we
 believe in the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, who are of the same Substance and Glory; and to prove them so, he subjoins this Reason, ἐν οἷς τὸ βάπτισμα τελειώσιν ἔχει. In them our Baptism hath its consummation. Baptism, which he calls *ὁμολογία Θεότητος*, a Confession of their Divinity.

Theoph. in
Matth. 28.
19.

Theophylact in his Comment upon this Form of Baptism: *In the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, tells us *τῶν προσώπων ἐν ὀνόματι*, the Name of the three Persons is but *One*; and what is that, *τὸ Θεός*, 'tis God, each Person being so.

Socra. Hist.
Ecccl. 1. 10.
cap. 26.

Nay, *Arius* himself did once pretend that he believed, even as we now really do, in the whole *Trinity*, and why he did so, he gave this account in that *Creed* of his, which he presented to *Constantine* the Great; *πύττω τὴν πίστιν παρελήφαμεν ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας εὐαγγελίας*, we have received this Faith out of the Holy Gospels; and he particularly instanceth in this Form of Baptism, as the ground of his Faith. *λέγουσι τὸ Κύριε τοῖς ἑαυτῆς μαθηταῖς, παρόντες, μαρτυροῦντες πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄνομα τῆς πατρὸς, ἔ τῆ υἱοῦ, ἔ τῆ ἁγίας πνεύματος*. Our Lord saying to his Disciples, *Go, teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. The conjunction of these three Persons in this sacred Institution, importing their equal Dignity, prevailed with *Arius* to believe in them all. And that this Faith of his was then sincere, he added this solemn Protestation, *μὴ*

μη πύτω ἔτω πυνόμεν, ἔ ἀποδεχόμεθα
ἀληθῶς, ὡς πῶσαι καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, ἔ
αὶ γεγραμὴ διδασκαλία, αἷς κτ' πάντα πυνέ-
ομεν, κρείττες ἡμῶν ἔστιν ὁ Θεός, ἔ νῦν, ἔ
ἐν τῇ μελλούσῃ κρείσσον. If we do not thus
believe, πατέρα, υἱόν, ἔ πνεῦμα ἅγιον,
the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. If
we do not truly acknowledge them,
as the whole Catholick Church, and
the Scriptures, the which we assert in
all things, do teach us, God is our
Judge at present, and will be so, when
the Great Day comes. Thus did *Arius*
himself from the *Conjunction* of these
three Persons in this Form of Baptism
conclude, and that with reason, that
the Son, and the Holy Spirit, are of
equal Dignity with the Father.

But this is not the only Text, where-
in we find these three glorious Per-
sons thus conjoined; St. *John* tells
us, *There are Three that bear record in* Joh. 5.7.
Heaven; the Father, the Word, and the
Holy Ghost, and these Three are One:
One what? not one Person, for then
they could not be Three, but what
Three are they? not three Names only,
for 'tis not Names, but Persons or
Things, that can bear record, and why
any one Person only should subscribe
himself, as a Witness, under three di-

distinct Denominations, I think, no good reason can be assigned.

That St. *John* means three several Persons may well be took for a granted Truth; and if so, since the *Father*, who is the first Witness here named, is by our *Socinians* owned to be God; the *Word*, and the *Holy Ghost*, who are joined with the Father as two other Witnesses of equal Credit, must be God too; because, within a Verse or two, the joint Testimony of all Three

1 *Joh. 5. 9.* is expressly called, *the witness of God*. And therefore *Oecumenius* well concludes; τῇ τῷ πνεύματι Φωνῇ σημαίνει ὁ Θεός ἐπὶ τῷ πνεύματι ὁ Θεός. In this Text by the Word, *Spirit*, God is meant, for the Spirit also is God.

Oecumen.
in locum.

Again; St. *Paul* joins these three glorious Persons together in that Petition of his for the Church of *Corinth*: 2 *Co. 13. 14* The Grace of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. That these words are a Prayer, I think, no Man will deny; as such doth *Theophylact* and *Oecumenius* own it, and St. *Chrysostom* expressly saith of St. *Paul*, εἰς εὐχὴν καταλύει τὸν λόγον, he doth here end his Discourse with a Prayer. And if it be a Prayer, to whom doth St.

Theoph.
Oecumen.
(*hryf.* in
loc.

Paul

Paul direct it? either to no body, or to the whole Trinity in Conjunction. For, as Grotius observes, *sunt hic, ut & in Baptismo, aperte nomina & recedat.* Grotius in loc. The whole Trinity is here expressly named, as it also is in the Form of Baptism; so that if St. Paul doth here pray at all, he prayeth to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost too.

And since St. Paul did direct his humble Petitions for spiritual Blessings to none but God; we may from this Request of his very justly infer the Doctrine of the Trinity, so thought several Interpreters of this Text: *Hoc loco distinctè nobis insinuantur tres in Divinis Personæ;* so one: and thus another, *Notant hic significari sanctissimam Trinitatem ὁμοούσιον, consubstantialem, eam scilicet ejusdem esse naturæ, Potentiæ, operationis, &c.* And from this place doth Gregory Thaumaturgus draw an Argument. *Quod venerabilis est sancta Trinitas, non separata, nec alienata:* Gr. Thau. in Exp. Symb. p. 101. Hence also doth St. Chrysostom, and after him Theophylact, break out into this expression, *πᾶς δὲ εἰς οὐ τὸ πνεῦμα ἀ-στρέψας;* where now are they, who slight the Spirit, as if he were not God; since St. Paul himself doth here address his solemn Petition, as well to the Holy

Holy Spirit, as to the Father, and to the Son?

Indeed that Observation of *Gregory Nazianzen* is true, *οὐκ ἐστὶν ἓν τὸ ὁμοούσιον*; Things, which are not of the same Substance, Nature and Dignity, are sometimes numbred together; *Solomon* tells us, *There be three things, which go well; a Lion, a Grey-hound, an He-goat.* These three sorts of Beasts, though here reckoned together, are yet no way like to one another, they agree in nothing, save only their *Generical Nature*, as being all living and irrational Creatures. But altho' things of different Natures are sometimes reckoned together, yet this doth no way weaken my present Argument, which is, that the *Conjunction* of the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, in several Texts, doth evidence the *Equality* of their Dignity, and prove each Person to be truly God.

So thought the same Father; for, in the same Oration, amongst other Arguments, whereby he proves the Deity of the *Holy Ghost*, this is one, *οὐκ ἐστὶν ἓν τὸ ὁμοούσιον*, he is *connumerated* and ranked together with the *Father*, and the *Son*; and that in such Texts, wherein they are all mention'd as Persons of *one* and the

Greg. Naz.
Or. 37.
p. 604.

Greg. Naz.
Or. 37.
p. 610.

the same *Authority*, and *equal Objects* of *Divine worship*. But,

2. The Scriptures do once and again ascribe to the blessed Spirit, the *Name* and *Title* of God, and that in such a manner, and upon such accounts, as prove him to be a *Divine Person* indeed.

True it is, that the bare Name of God, nakedly considered, is not enough to prove every one that bears it, to be a *Divine Person*. It was given to *Moses*; *I have made thee a God to Pharaoh*: Exod. 7. 1. 'Tis given to *Magistrates*; *I have said*, Ps. 82. 6. *ye are Gods*: 'Tis given to *Pagan Idols*; *There are Gods many*: 'Tis given to the Devil; for, even he is called, *The God of this world*. But all these were only *Titular Gods*, reputed *Deities*; or *Gods* by deputation, improperly and *Metonymically* so stiled. But 'tis not thus with the *Holy Ghost*, who is called *God*, and really is so.

Consider we that expression of our Lord: *If I with the Finger of God cast out Devils*, &c. but what means our Lord by this *Finger of God*? another Evangelist explains it thus; *If I cast out Devils by the Spirit of God*. And why the Spirit is here called *the Finger of God*, *Theophylact* gives us this reason:

Theoph. in
Luk. 11.20

son: Ἐπὶ ὡσαύτε δὲ δάκτυλος ὁμοῦσιν ἔστι
τῷ ὅλῳ σώματι, ἔτι καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὁμοῦσιν
τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ. Because as the
Finger is of the same Substance with
the whole Body, so is the Spirit of the
same Substance with God the Father,
and God the Son.

This casting out of Devils St. Chry-
sostom calleth, Μεγίστης δυνάμεως ἔργον,
Mat. 12.28 a Work of the greatest Power; and

yet the Jews ascribed it to Beelzebub,
and that our Lord called, a Blasphemy
against the Holy Ghost, and pronounced
it a Sin unpardonable; but why un-
pardonable, if the Holy Ghost be, as
some vile Wretches have imagined, a
Creature, and not truly God?

1 Cor. 6.19.

Again, St. Paul saith, *The Body is the
Temple of the Holy Ghost*; and surely
Temples ought to be dedicated to none
but God; and such is the Holy Ghost;
for the same St. Paul saith elsewhere,
ye are the Temple of God; and again,

1 Cor. 3.
16, 17.

*the Temple of God is holy, which Tem-
ple ye are*: The sanctified Bodies of
good Men, which one Text stiles, *the
Temples of the Holy Ghost*, the other
two do expressly call *the Temples of
God*, and is not that an undeniable
Argument, that *the Holy Ghost is
God*?

So

So thought *Athanasius*; *Ἀνάγκη πᾶσι* Athan. in
τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ εἶναι κτίσμα, διὸ τὸ πνεῦμα Epist. ad.
λαμβάνων ἡμᾶς τὸ Θεὸς χρηματίζεται. ad Scrap.
Tis p. 12.

not possible that the *spirit* should be a
Creature; because every one, who re-
ceives the *spirit*, is called the *Temple* of
God. And that the *Spirit* is God in-
deed, he thus proves elsewhere;

ὡς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα, δι' αὐτὸ θεοποιεῖν In Epist.
ἢ εἰ ἢ θεοποιεῖ, ἔκ ἀμφίβολον ὅτι ἡ τέταρτη ad Ser. Sp.
φύσις Θεὸς ἐστίν. S. non esse
Creat. p.
198, 199.

They, in whom the
spirit resides, are by him made parta-
kers of the *Divine* Nature; and if so,
we cannot doubt, but that the Nature
of the *spirit* himself, is indeed the very
Nature of God.

Of the same mind was Great St. Ba-
sil, who from these words, *your Bodies* Basil. M.
are the Temples of the Holy Ghost; or, adv. Eun.
which is all one, *ye are the Temple* of l. 3. p. 83.
of God, and the *spirit* of God dwelleth in
you, urgeth thus,

*εἰ ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ Θεὸς ἐνοι-
κῶν λέγει διὰ τὸ πνεῦμα, πῶς ἔχει
φανερῶς ἀσεβείας εἶναι αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα
λέγειν ἀμείζονα τὸ Θεότιτον;* If God
be said to dwell in us by his *spirit*, is it
not manifest impiety, to say that the
spirit himself is void of *Divinity*? and
again, *εἰ Θεὸς ὀνομάζομεν τὴν καὶ ἀρετὴν
τελείαν, ἢ τὴν τελείωσιν διὰ τὸ πνεῦμα,*
πῶς τὸ ἑτέρας θεοποιεῖν, αὐτὸ τὸ Θεότιτον

ἀπὸ

ἀνθρώποις; If the Spirit make virtuous Men like to God, how can he, who imparts the Divine Nature to other Persons, ever be presumed to want himself?

But that the blessed Spirit is indeed a Divine Person is further evident from that Speech of St. Peter to Ananias, *Acts 5. 3, 4* why hath Satan filled thy heart to lye to the Holy Ghost? thou hast not lyled unto Men, only or chiefly unto Men, but unto God; well, and what may we infer from thence? we may conclude, as many Interpreters do; *Ergo spiritus sanctus est Deus*; Therefore the Holy Ghost is God: for Ananias did not lye to Men alone; but, since he lyled to the Holy Ghost, he did, for that very reason, lye to God also.

Lorius in
locum.

Greg. Naz.
Or. 37.
p. 611.

This Text is so clear a Proof, that Gregory Nazianzen bespeaks every one, which knoweth this Scripture, thus, *ὡς λίαν ὁμῶς παχὺς πρὸς εἰ καὶ πρὸς τὸ πνεῦμα* &c, *εἰ τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ ὁ δὲ τὸν δαΐμονα* &c; what a very dull set art thou, and how great a stranger to the Spirit, if notwithstanding this and other Texts, thou doest still so much as doubt the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, and yet needest a Teacher to inform thee about it.

Gre-

Gregory Nyssen, expounding this Text, writes thus; *ὁ μὲν οὖν καὶ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τὸν ἅγιον πνεῦμα τὸ Ἀνάνιος δια-
λέξαμενος, καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν Θεὸν τοὺς ὁμοῦς
ἀνθρώπους ἐνόησεν ἑαυτὸν*: St. Peter, saying
that Ananias lyed to the Holy Ghost and
to God; doth by these two Words, the
Holy Ghost and God, declare to all pious
and intelligent Souls one and the same
Person.

Greg. Nyl.
in Or. de
Deitate Fi-
lii & Sp. S.
p. 910.

Accordingly St. Hierom tells us thus,
referring to this very Text: *Ut sciamus
venerem, qui exasperat spiritum sanctum,
Deum offendere, Petrus Apostolus signifi-
cantius loquitur, &c.* That we may
know that every one, who exasperates
the Holy Spirit, doth offend God, the
Apostle Peter very plainly declares,
when he tells Ananias, who had lyed
to the Holy Ghost: *Thou hast not lyed
unto Men, but to God.*

Hieron. in
Esa. c. 63.

From the same Text doth St. Austin
also inferr the Godhead of the Holy
Ghost; for thus he demands: *Quid?*
spiritus sanctus non est Deus? What?
is not the Holy Spirit God? he an-
swers; Plane Deus, 'Tis plain that he
is God; but how doth he prove it?
thus: Audi Petrum Anania fraudatori
improperantem, &c. Hear Peter repro-
ving that Cheater Ananias thus: *why*
hath

August. de
Temp. Bar-
barico T. 9.
p. 215.

bath Satan filled thy heart to lye to the Holy Ghost? Thou hast not lye'd unto Men, but to God; and hence St. Austin draws this Conclusion; *Ecce & spiritus sanctus Deus*; Behold the Holy Ghost also is God.

To these Authorities I shall add no more, save only that of Epiphanius, who writes thus; *ἐπεὶ τὸ ἀγίον πνεῦμα ὁ Θεὸς* Πέτρος ἀποκαλύπτει ἡμᾶς: Touching the Deity of the Holy Ghost, St. Peter doth secure us; but how? *λέγων τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς*, &c. Saying to Ananias, why bath Satan filled thy heart to lye to the Holy Ghost? thou hast not lye'd to Men, but unto God; but how is that proved? *Διότι ἐκ Θεοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐκ ἀδελφῶν Θεοῦ*. Because the Spirit is from God, and doth not differ from him.

Pearson in
Exp. Sym.
Apost.

I conclude this Argument with the words of a late and learned Bishop of our own Church: To lye to the Holy Ghost is not to lye to Men, because the Holy Ghost is not Man; It is not to lye to any Angel or any Creature, because the Holy Ghost is no Angel, no Creature; but to lye to the Holy Ghost is to lye to God, because the Holy Ghost is God: So he is both in Name and real Being.

3. The Scriptures do ascribe to the Holy Ghost such Attributes, as are proper

per and peculiar to a Person, but to such a Person only, as is Divine.

To prove the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, Gregory Nazianzen, and Great St. Basil have collected abundance of Epithets and Characters, which the Scriptures bestow upon him, *πνεῦμα κατ' ἄριστον, πνεῦμα συνέχον, ζωοντις, &c.* And so Gregory Nyssen, τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ἀίδιον, ὡς φησὶ οὐδὲς, &c. the Psalmist styles him, *רוח טוב* the good spirit, essentially and infinitely Good; and such a good Being there is but one, that is God.

But of those many Attributes, which are ascribed to the Holy Spirit, I shall insist but upon these Three, his Omnipotence, his Omnipresence, and his Omniscience; each of which is enough to prove him God.

'Tis evident from the Holy Scriptures, that the blessed spirit of God is Omnipotent; and there are three things in sacred Writ ascribed to him, which prove him so.

1. The Scriptures do ascribe to the Holy Ghost, the Creation of the World, and that is a Work which requires an Almighty Power.

Moses tells us, God created the Heaven and the Earth; and so again, The Lord made Heaven and Earth; 'Tis he,

X whom

Greg. Naz. Or. 37. p. 610. Basil. M. adv. Eunom. l. 3. p. 25. Greg. Nyss. de Trin. p. 441. Ps. 143. 10

Is. 48. 16

Gen. 1. 1.

Exod. 20.

whom the Evangelical Prophet stiles,
 Isa. 40. 28. *The everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the Ends of the Earth.* And indeed it must needs be so; for, since Creation is, *productio Entis ex non Ente*, the Production of something out of nothing, there being a vast distance betwixt these two Terms, it must be the effect of an Infinite Power, and such Power there is none, save only that of God.

Upon which account St. Austin tells us, *Nec malos, sed nec bonos Angelos esse putare Creatores*: 'Tis not lawful to think that evil Angels, no nor good ones, can be Creators. And if not Angels, much less any other Creatures; so say the Schools, *Nullam Creaturam posse instrumentaliter concurrere ad Creationem*, so Bellarmine; and before him Aquinas, *Impossibile est quod alicui Creatura conveniat creare, neque virtute propria, neque instrumentaliter, sive per Ministerium*; 'Tis impossible for any Creature to create any thing, either by its own Power, or as an Instrument in the hand of another. 'Tis the Judgment of these and other learned Men, that a creating Power, through the Incapacity of Creatures to be the Subjects of it, is absolutely incommunicable.

Now,

August. de
 Trin. l. 3.
 c. 8. T. 3.

Bellar. de
 effectu Sac.
 l. 2. c. 11.
 p. 156.

Aquin. 1.
 par. qu.
 45. Art. 5.

Now, if we may conclude that there is no creating Power but in God alone, then must we also conclude, that the *Holy Ghost* is God; because the Scriptures tell us, that he was the Creator, and still is the Conservator of the Universe. *Moses*, describing the very beginning of the Creation, writes thus; *The Spirit of God moved upon the Face of the waters*; the question is, what is here meant by the *Spirit of God*, and by the word *Moved*? The word in the Original Language, which we render *Spirit*, is רוח which as *Aynsworth* tells us, signifieth any *Spirit*, Ghost, Breath, or Wind; but in this Text it cannot signify the *Wind*, because there was no Wind as yet created. But that by this *spirit of God*, is here meant the *Holy Ghost*, is the general Judgment of Interpreters. So saith *Pererius*, *est interpretatio ferme omnium Patrum, tam Græcorum, quam Latinorum, per spiritum Dei hoc loco significari spiritum sanctum, quam sententiam secuta est Ecclesia Catholica*. Almost all the Fathers both Greek and Latin, do here by the *Spirit of God*, understand the *Holy Ghost*, and so doth the Universal Church. Nay, *Aynsworth* cites some Ancient Rabbines for the same opinion; as the *Thargum* of *Hierusalem*;

Gen. 1. 2.

Aynsw. in locum.

Pererius in locum.

Jerusalem, which renders this Text thus; *The Spirit of Mercies from before the Lord*; and R. Menachem, who interprets it thus, *The Spirit of wisdom, called the Spirit of the living God*; or, as another expresseth it, *The Spirit of the Messiah*.

And indeed it could be no other Spirit, save only the *Spirit of God*, considering the Work, which is here and elsewhere ascribed unto him. The Text saith, *The Spirit of God moved upon the Face of the Waters*? but what means that? 'tis a Metaphor: the Hebrew word, *Rachaph*, signifying, as Critics tell us, the hovering of a Bird over her young ones newly hatched to cherish them; and so it here imports St. Chrysostom's *ἐκκινῶν ἐνέργειαν*; or, as Pererius words it, *efficaciam vitalem*; which our Assembly of English Divines express thus, *The effectual quickning Power of the Holy Ghost, which upheld, sustained, and gave vertue to that great and general heap, the newly created Chaos*.

Chryl. Perer. & Engl. Annot. in locum.

And as this blessed Spirit was thus concerned in the Work of the first Day's Creation, so had he an hand in the Work of the other Days too. For

Job 26. 13. *Job* tells us, *By his Spirit he hath garnished*

nished the Heavens; some Criticks think the Prefix Δ which we render, By, to be Redundant, and accordingly Vatablus reads the Text thus; *Spiritus ejus ornavit Caelos, His Spirit hath adorned the Heavens.* with Sun, Moon, and Stars. But what means he by this Spirit? *Quo cuncta creavit*, saith Drusus; that Spirit by whom he created all things. 'Tis that which Job acknowledgeth as to himself: *The Spirit of God hath made me; Spiritus sanctus, Dei manus altera, quæ cum altera, i.e. cum verbo, hominem creavit;* or, as the same Author speaks elsewhere: *Filius atque spiritus sanctus cum Patre creaverunt hominem, The Son and Holy Ghost with the Father created Man.* And not only Man, but all other Creatures too, of whom the Psalmist saith, *Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, and they are created;* hence St. Hierom argueth thus; *Si spiritus creat, ergo Deus est; ita enim creat, quoniam & Pater:* If the Spirit create, then is he God, and create he doth, because the Father also doth so.

•From these and some other like Texts, did the Ancient Fathers collect the creating Power of the Holy Ghost; *Greg. Naz. Or. 44. p. 714.* τὸ πνεῦμα συνδημιουργεῖ μετὰ υἱοῦ τῆς κτίσεως, and so again, *Id. Or. 37. p. 610.* ἀνὰ τὸν

Vatab. & D. ubi in locum.

Job 33. 4. Pineda in Job 33. 4. & 10. 8.

Ps. 104. 30. Hieron. in locum.

πάντων ποιητὴν, The *Spirit* together with the *Son* created all things. And the same Father elsewhere saith of St.

Id. Or. 24.
p. 431.

Paul, τὴν ἐκείραν τὸ Θεὸς τὰ πνεῦμα δίδωσι. He ascribes to the *Spirit* the efficacious Operation of God. Accordingly another Father calls the Holy

Greg. Nyss.
adv. Eun.
p. 62.

Spirit, τὸ ζωοποιεῖντα πάντα, him that *enlivens* all things; and the same Author in another place writes very Dog-

Greg. Nyss.
in Or. Ca-
tech. c. 4.
p. 481.

matically concerning *Christ* and his Holy *Spirit*, and of both he speaks thus;

τὸ εἶναι λόγον Θεοῦ, καὶ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, ἐκωδὸς ὑπερβάσας δυνάμεις, ποιητὴς τῶν ὁρατῶν, καὶ ἀεικλιτῶν τῶν ὄντων, ἐκ τῆς Θεοπνεύσαντος ῥαφῶν ἐπαγγέλλον δεικνύ.

That the *word* of God, and the *Spirit* of God are Powers substantially subsisting, the makers and upholders of all created Beings, is very evidently declared in those Scriptures, which were written by Divine Inspiration.

There is a Tradition, that *Gregory* surnamed *Thaumaturgus*, received a System of Faith by Revelation; a *Creed* embraced, saith *Gerard Vossius*, both by the Eastern and Western Churches.

Ger. Vof.
in notis in
opera Gre.
Thaumaturg.
Greg. Nyss.
in vita Gr.
Thaumaturg.
p. 278.

In this *Creed*, as it is recorded by *Gregory Nyssen*, the blessed *Spirit* is stiled,

ζωὴ, ζώντων αἰτία, Life, and the Cause of all things living.

In

In short, *Epiphanius* speaks thus of our Lord, and his Holy Spirit; *A μυστὸν* Epiphan. *ἀνεκάνθησαν ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ θεὸν καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν, καὶ* Har. 74. *ὁ ἰσὺς κτίσας τὰ πάντα ἐκ ἀνεκάνθησαν αἰῶνας* p. 196. *οὐκ ἐπερὶ τὰς μετέ.* These two are invested with an unceivable Power and Dominion, and create all things co-operating with the Father throughout infinite Ages.

Now then, from these forenamed Texts, and these Authorities of Judicious Men grounded thereupon, we may safely conclude that the Holy Spirit is possess'd with a creating Power, which being Omnipotent and Essential to him must needs prove him God.

2. The Scriptures do ascribe to the Holy Spirit the Resurrection of the Dead, and that is a second Work, which requires an Almighty Power, and supposeth his to be so.

There are so many difficulties in, and such strong Objections against the Doctrine of the Resurrection, that the Learned Men of the Heathen World, though some of them granted the Immortality of the Soul, yet the Resurrection of the Body they thought to be not only needless and inconvenient, but altogether Impracticable too. Such an opinion there was in St. Paul's time,

who demanded a Reason for it: *why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the Dead?* Such were the general thoughts of the Pagans; accordingly Celsus in Origen calleth it *adύνατον*, a thing impossible; and again, *ὁ Θεὸς ἔτι βυλῆος, ἔτι δυνάμεως*, a thing, which God neither will do, nor can.

The same opinion was crept in amongst the Jews. *The Sadduces say that there is no Resurrection:* It was also found, if not in the Church, yet at least in the Town of Corinth. *How say some among you, that there is no Resurrection of the Dead?* Now, the reason, why this great Article of our Faith was so generally denied, must be the consideration of those Intricacies which are found in the Nature of this word, there being much to be said against it, but nothing for it, save only the faithful Promise, the Infinite Wisdom, and Almighty Power of God.

Now, that the Holy Spirit hath an hand in the raising of the Dead, is evident from that of St. Paul: *If the spirit of him which raised Jesus from the Dead, dwell in you; he, that raised Christ from the Dead, shall also quicken your mortal Bodies by his spirit, that dwelleth*

Orig. contra Cels. l. 1.
5. p. 240.

Matt. 2. 23.

Mar. 15. 12

Rom. 8. 11.

dwellerh in you: from these words a learned Interpreter raiseth this Inference: *Hinc patet spiritum sanctum in nobis inhabitantem esse causam Resurrectionis & vita gloriosa.* Est enim hic spiritus in se vita, omnia animans, vegetans, & vivificans, &c. Hence 'tis manifest, that the Holy Spirit, who dwells in us, is the Cause of our Resurrection; and that glorious Life, which doth attend it; for indeed this Spirit is Life in himself, a quickning and enlivening Spirit. And accordingly St. Chrysostom, mentioning this glorious Work of the Resurrection,

Corn. 2
lap. in loc.

stiles this blessed Spirit τὸν ἀΐσαν τοσαύτης τῆς τιμῆς, The Author of this so great an Honour. And thus Calvin, *Si potentia spiritus Dei Christus excitatus est, ut spiritus aeternam retinet potentiam, eandem in nobis quoque exeret;* since Christ was raised by the Power of the Divine Spirit, and since that spirit doth still retain the same Eternal Power, he will exert it in our Resurrection too.

Chryf. in
Rom. Hom.
13.

Calvin. in
Rom. c. 8.
11.

And upon the same Account did Gregory Nazianzen stile this blessed Spirit thus, τὸ ποιεῖ, τὸ ἀναρτῆσον, the Spirit that made us; and the Spirit that doth and will re-make us; but how so? he re-makes the Soul of Man διὰ βαπτίσ-

Greg. Naz.
Or. 37.
p. 610.

ματι,

uals, by our *Baptism*, and he will re-make the *Body* of Man, d^r *Awakenings*, by our *Resurrection*. As he did at the first create our *Flesh* out of *dust*, so will he at last re-create the same *Flesh* out of the same *dust* again.

Now then, if from the Authority of God's Word, and the Testimonies of learned Men built upon it, we may conclude that the *Resurrection* of the Dead hath been, and will be the Work of the *Holy Ghost*; we must also conclude that his Power is *Omnipotent*, and that *Omnipotence* must speak him truly God.

3. The Scriptures do very often ascribe to the *Holy Ghost* the *Regeneration* of Souls, and that is a third Work, which requires an Almighty Power, and proves his to be so.

When *Saul* was newly converted, and instead of persecuting began to pray, 'tis said of him thus: *Behold, he prayeth*; the expression intimates, that the Conversion of this Man was a Work of wonderful Power, why else is it ushered in with this Note of Admiration, *Eccē, behold, he prayeth*? The Conversion, Sanctification, or Regeneration of Mortal Souls is a matter so exceeding difficult, that the Scriptures

com-

compare it to such Works, as can be wrought by no hand, but that alone which is Omnipotent. 'Tis compared to the *Resurrection* of the Dead; so the Apostle, *Thou hast he quickened, who were dead in sins.* 'Tis compared to Works of *Creation*; so intimates the Psalmist, *And Create in me a clean* Ps. 51. 10.
Heart, O God. St. Paul tells regenerate Eph. 2. 10.
Souls, Ye are created in Christ Jesus; and again, *If any Man be in Christ, he* 2 Cor. 5. 17
is a new Creature, and this new Creature is the Workmanship of Infinite Power; St. Paul calleth it, *The exceeding greatness of his Power, according to the working of his mighty Power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him fromt he dead.* The truth is, tho' all works be equally easie to an Omnipotent God, yet in their own Nature they are not so; the making of this new Creature is in it self an harder Work than the making of the old ones; the Psalmist tells us, *He spake, and it was done.* Ps. 33. 9.
 In making the World God met with no opposition, but in this new Creation he meets with much; for, as St. Paul saith, *the Flesh lusteth against the Spirit;* this Work of Grace is so much opposed, that he spake not much amiss, who said, *Difficilius est Peccatorem*

rem justicare, quàm Cælum & Terram creare, It is an harder Work for God to *justify* a Sinner, than it was to *create* Heaven and Earth.

Now, this gracious Work, which of all Works seems to be the most difficult, do the Scriptures very frequently and very plainly ascribe to the *Holy Spirit*; so doth St. Paul, *Ye are sanctified, ye are justified*; but by whom? *By the spirit of our God.* Our Lord himself intimates as much; *Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, &c.* by vertue of these and the like Texts, do the Greek Fathers familiarly stile the *Holy Ghost*, τὸ ἁγιάζον, the Sanctifier, τὸ ἀνακτιζόν, the Re-creator. And because every regenerate Man is *born of the spirit*, he is for that very reason said to be *born of God*; for, since this Work requires an Almighty Power, he who doth it, must needs be truly God. But,

Epi. Hær.
74. p. 901.
Naz. Or.
37. p. 610.

2. 'Tis evident from the Scriptures, that the Holy Ghost is *Omnipresent*, and that is a second Attribute, which proves him God.

'Tis certain that all Creatures, being *finite* Substances, are *definitive vel circumscriptive*, so determined, limited, or confined to such or such a particular place,

place, that none of them, the Humane Nature of Christ not excepted, can ever be at the same time in more places than one. But the Divine Nature being infinite and immense, 'tis God's Prerogative, and his alone, to be every where at once; for, as his Eternity is commensurate with all Successions of Time, so is his Immensity commensurate with all distances of Places, wherein he is Repletive, *per Essentiam, Potentiam, & Presentiam*, by his Essence, Power, and Presence, as the Schoolmen speak.

And the certainty of this Divine Ubiquity, we may learn from that demand of God mentioned by the Prophet. *Can any hide himself in secret places, that I shall not see him, saith the Lord: do not I fill Heaven and Earth, saith the Lord?* This Question the Psalmist thus resolves, *If I ascend up into Heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in Hell, behold thou art there, &c.* Certainly there is *Μεγα χάσμα*, a great Gulph, a vast distance betwixt Heaven and Hell, and yet God is at once in both. In short, *Deus nullo loco includitur, excluditur nullo.* God is neither shut in nor cut of any Place whatever, but is Omnipresent.

And

into all truth, and again, the Holy Ghost Joh. 14. 26
 shall teach you all things; not at once,
 but as occasion should require; and
 that he might be with them upon
 all Emergencies, their Lord gave them
 this assurance, *I will pray the Father,* Joh. 14. 16
and he shall give you another Comforter,
that he may abide with you for ever,
even the Spirit of Truth. Now, since
 these Apostles, to whom these promi-
 ses were made, were, by their Lords
 own Command, to be dispersed through-
 out all Nations, how could these pro-
 mises be made good? how could the
 Spirit be to every one of them, being
 apart and separated in several King-
 doms, a ready guide and constant as-
 sistant, were he not Omnipresent? but
 since these Texts and these Promises do
 prove him so, they must likewise prove
 him truly God. Once more,

3. 'Tis evident from the Scriptures
 that the Holy Ghost is Omniscient, and
 none is so, but God alone.

The only Intelligent Creatures are
 Men and Angels, but none of these
 are, or even can be Omniscient: as for
 the generality of Men, we are so far
 from understanding all things, that we
 do certainly know very little, nay,
 the Text saith, *we are but of yesterday* Joh. 8. 9.

an

and know nothing: So it is with Man in common. And as for Men that were
 1 Cor. 13. inspired, St. Paul saith, we know but in part, no more than God was pleased to reveal to them.

The School-men indeed do give to the blessed Angels the name of *Intelligences* in the Abstract; and yet of some things even they are Ignorant; nay, our Lord, as Man confessed himself to be so, of that day and hour knoweth no man; no, not the Angels of Heaven, neither the Son. And if our Lords own *Humane* Nature was not *Omniscient*, then can no *Created* understanding ever be so.

But as for God, that is truly affirmed of him, which can be so affirmed of none besides, His understanding is
 Pl. 147. 5. infinite: To him, saith St. Paul, all things are naked and open; for they are to him, and to him alone; and yet so they were, are, and ever will be to the Holy Ghost. What else doth St. Paul mean, when he saith, the spirit searcheth all things; yea, the deep things of God; and again, the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. The Spirit indeed is here said, *ἐπερωτᾷ* to search, which Phrase, when applied to Men, imports something of present
 1 Cor. 2. 10, 11. igno-

ignorance; for what need a Man search after that, which he knoweth already: but here 'tis otherwise, Οὐκ ἀγνοίας, ἀλλ' ἀκριβὲς γνώσεως τὸ ἐρευνᾶν ἐνδείκνυται, or as another words it, ἀκριβὲς καταλήψεως. This search of the spirit doth not suppose any Ignorance in him, but his exact knowledge and full comprehension. For the same Phrase is elsewhere applied to God the Father, who is said ἐρευνᾶν τὰς καρδίας, to search the hearts of men, as being one ὁ τὰ βάθη αὐτῶν εἰδώς, that knoweth the depths which are therein; so here, the Spirit is said to search the deep things of God, ὡς ἐντευφῶν τῇ θεωρίᾳ τοῦ μυστηρίου τῆς Θεᾶς, as one taking much pleasure in the Contemplation of the Mysteries of God. To the same purpose writes another thus, πάντα μὲν ἐρευνᾶν, καὶ τὰ βάθη τῆς Θεᾶς τὰ πνεύματι μεμαρτύρητο, οὐκ ὡς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐντευφῶν τῇ θεωρίᾳ, 'Tis testified of the spirit, that he searcheth all things, even the deep things of God, but not as one, that was at any time Ignorant of them, but as one always highly pleased with such a Speculation.

Chrysoft.
Theophyl.
& Oecum.
in locum.

Theophyl.
in locum.

Grig. Naz.
Or. 20. p.
362.

'Tis the saying of an Ancient Father τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα οὐδὲν ἀγνοεῖν τὸ τῆς Θεᾶς δυνάμει, The Holy Spirit cannot be Ignorant

Basil. M.
adv. Eu-
nom. l. 4.
p. 101.

norant of any of the things of God, for, if he himself had not known them, how could he have revealed them unto the World? St. Paul told the Elders of the Church; *I have not shunned to declare unto you all the Counsel of God.* But how came St. Paul himself to be acquainted with it? that he tells us, (though in a modest expression) *I think that I have the Spirit of God.* And indeed he might do more than think so; for, as *Athanasius* justly demands τὸ θεὸν τὸ τὴν τῆς Θεοῦ γνώσιν ἔχον, ἀλλ' ἢ τὸ πνεῦμα; what is it that hath and doth Communicate the knowledge of God and his Counsels, except the Spirit? Who was it, that revealed to the Prophets *future* Events of things, not only *contingent*, but very *Improbable*; nay, as to the common Course of Nature utterly *Impossible* too? The Prophet *Isaias* several hundred years before the Incarnation of Christ, foretold his Birth, though it were so Miraculous, that many would not believe it, no, not when he was actually so born, *Behold, a Virgin shall conceive, and bear a Son, Mater & Virgo*; that a woman should be a *Mother*, and yet a *Virgin* too, was one of St. *Bernard's* three great wonders.

But

But how came the Prophet to understand that certainly it should be for who was it that informed him? to this St. Paul hath left us a very Satisfactory answer: *Well spake the Holy Ghost by the Prophet Isaias.* And not by him alone, but by all the other Prophets too, of whom St. Peter saith, *the Spirit of Christ was in them,* and again, *holy men of God spake, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,* now then, since the Blessed Spirit is that Person, who revealed the will of God to all his Prophets; who certainly foretold things to come; and such things, as were far beyond the comprehension of Men and Angels; since it was he, who, according to our Lord's promise, did guide his Apostles into all Truth, and brought all things to their Remembrance, we may safely conclude, that he knoweth all things, even the deep things of God.

Act. 28. 25.

1 Pet. 1.

11.
2 Pet. 1.

21.

And from this Consideration doth St. Hierom rightly infer the Deity of the Holy Ghost; for thus he writes, *præclarum hoc adversus Hæreticos, qui Creaturam Spiritum Sanctum dicunt.* Unde hic ostendit non Solum Creaturam non esse, verum etiam quod ipse solus in-

Hieronym.

in pr. Ep. ad

Cor. c. 2.

v. 10. 11.

teriora Dei & profunda rimetur, quippe ut ejusdem natura atq; Substantie sit cum Christo. This Text is a very clear Argument against those *Hereticks*, who affirm the *Holy Ghost* to be a *Creature*. For in as much as the Spirit is here said to search even the deep things of God, i.e. exactly to know them; it sheweth, not only that he is *no Creature*, but that he is of the *same Nature* and Substance with Christ, who is God the Son; his knowing even the deep things of God, imports his *Omniscience*, and that is another Attribute, which evidently proves him to be a *Divine Person*; one who is truly God.

But to enervate these Arguments, and to elude those Texts, upon which they are grounded, our *Socinians* tell us, that such Texts are *Figurative*, that there is in them a *Prosopopæia*; whereby *Personal Actions* are often ascribed to things or qualities, which are not Persons. St. Paul saith of Charity, It beareth all things, it believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. These and other *Personal Actions* are attributed to *Charity*, which yet are proper to the *Person* only, in whom that noble Grace resides. So in our present

1 Cor. 13.
7.

present case, they tell us, that those *Divine* Actions are *Figuratively* ascribed to the *Spirit*, not that this Spirit is a *Person* subsisting in Co-operating of himself; but because he is the *Power* of God the *Father*, who thereby doth the works: So they. To which we answer.

This pretence of a *Prosopopæia*, as if those Personal Acts were really done by God the Father, which are only imputed to the Spirit, as being no more than the Power by which the Father works, will appear very absurd and ridiculous, if we can find some *personal operations* ascribed to the *Spirit*, which can never be ascribed to the *Father*. As for instance; the Holy Spirit is said to come, as *being sent*, but by whom, can God the Father be sent? the Holy Spirit is said to *receive*, but from what Donor's hand can God the Father be a Receiver? the Holy Spirit is said not to speak of himself, but who prompts and puts words into the mouth of God the Father? the Holy Spirit is said to make Intercession for us, but can God the Father become an Intercessor? if he can, let our *Socinians* tell us, with whom he interceeds. These

Joh. 14. 26.

Joh. 16. 13.

14.

Rom. 8. 26.

Instances are enough to evince, that the holy Spirit is not a *quality*, not that Energetical Power by which the Father acts, but a *Person* really subsisting in himself, since such Personal operations are Attributed to him, which cannot by any *Prosopopœia* be ascribed to God the Father.

2. My next and last work is to prove that the Holy Spirit is not only a *real Person*, but a Person so distinguished both from the Father and the Son, that he is neither the one nor the other.

To prove this truth, as it is easy, so is it now become very necessary too, because this licentious age hath produced some Men, who have revived the old Heresie of Noetus, of whom St. Austin writes thus, *Docbat Christum Eandem esse ipsam Patrem & Spiritum*: and so Epiphanius *Μονιμους ἢ αὐτὸν πατέρα, ἢ υἱόν, ἢ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ὁρῶντας*. He dreamed and taught that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were but one and the same Person. After him arose Sabellius, who promoted the same opinion, ἢ αὐτὸν εἶ πατέρα, ἢ αὐτὸν υἱόν, ἢ αὐτὸν εἶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, That the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit

August.
Hær. 36.
Tom. 6. p.
4.
Epiphani.
Hær. 57.
p. 481.

Idem. Hær.
62. p. 513.
62.

rit are not three distinct Persons; but only τρεῖς ὀνομασίες, three different denominations.

This Heretical opinion is so repugnant to so many express Texts, that it is in the Language of *Epiphanius*, ἐσφιδεγτος easie to be Confuted; for, Idem. Her 57. P. 482

1. 'Tis very evident from the holy Scriptures, that the blessed Spirit is a Person distinct from God the Father.

For the Spirit is said to proceed from the Father; and therefore he cannot be the Father; for no Person can possibly proceed from himself. Again, the Spirit is said to be sent by the Father, Joh. 15. 26 and if so, the Person sending, and the Person who is sent, cannot be the same. Nay more, the Spirit is said, to be sent from the Father, Joh. 14. 26 and if so, can any Person be said to be sent from himself? these Texts are sufficient to prove, that the Holy Spirit is not, cannot be, the Father. Joh. 15. 26

Z 4

2. 'Tis

2. 'Tis evident from the Holy Scriptures that the blessed Spirit is a Person distinct from the Son.

For when our Lord was newly Baptized, the *Holy Ghost descended upon him*; and if so, *the holy Ghost, who did descend*, and our Lord on whom he descended, cannot be the same. Besides, our Lord told his Apostles thus, *I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, even the Spirit of truth*. Here doth our Lord put a clear difference betwixt *himself* and his Holy Spirit, whom he calls *ἄλλος another*, and therefore not himself.

But to name no more Texts, we find a plain distinction betwixt all three Persons in the Form of Baptism, which must be administred, *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*: If these three here mention'd, *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, are allowed to be, what they certainly are, the *three Persons* in the God head, then is this Form of Baptism very consonant to its self, and Intelligible to us: but if not, if, according to the *Socinian Hypothesis*, the

Matth. 3.
16.

Joh. 14. 16.

Matth. 28.
19.

the first here nam'd be a *Person*, and that *Person* *God*; if the second be a *Person*, and that *Person* no more than a *meer Man*; and if the third be no *Person* at all; then must this Form of Baptism be thus Interpreted: *Baptizing them in the name*, i.e. by the *Authority*, or into the *Religion* and *Worship* of the *Father*, who is *God*; of the *Son*, who is a *Creature*; and of the *Holy Ghost*, who is nothing else but a *Power*, a *Quality* inherent in the *Nature* of *God*.

And is it imaginable that our blessed Saviour, who is the *wisdom* of *God*, who *spake* as never man *spake* besides, should institute such an uncouth, incoherent, and absurd Form of Baptism, as this must be, if so interpreted? Is it imaginable that our Meek and Humble Jesus, had he been no more than a *meer Man*, would ever, in this sacred Institution, have joyned himself with *God* his *Father*, as if his *Authority* were, and his *worship* ought to be, the very same with his; nor can we conceive, that our Lord would here have made a *distinct* mention of the *Father* and the *Holy Ghost*, if the

the *Holy Ghost* were not a distinct Person, but only the Power of God, for his Power, and all his other Attributes, though we frame to our selves distinct Ideas and various Conceptions of them, yet they are not really distinct from his Essence, they are himself.

And thus have I examined all this Man's pretences, and answered all his Arguments against the Doctrine of the blessed *Trinity*; and notwithstanding all that he doth, or ever can, object against the *Divinity* of Christ and the *Personality* of the *Holy Ghost*, I shall conclude this discourse with the words of a far better Author, τὸ πνεύμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἦν ᾐὲ, καὶ ἔστι, καὶ ἔσται, ὅτε ἀρχόμενον, ὅτε παύσμενον, ἀλλ' αἰὲ παύει καὶ ὅτε συντεταγμένον καὶ συναριθμώμενον. The *Holy Spirit* always was, is, and will be, without Beginning, without End, Co-ordinate and reckoned in the same rank with the Father and the Son. To which I shall add only that *Epiphonema* of *Epiphanius*,

Greg. Naz.
Or. 44 P.
711.

Epiph. in
Exp. fidel.
T. 2. l. 3. P.
1101.

τελὸς ἔστι ὄντως τέλει, τέλει ὁ πατήρ, τέλει ὁ υἱός, τέλει τὸ πνεύμα τὸ Ἅγιον, μία Θεότης, εἰς Θεός, ὃ ἡδύτατον, πμλθ

την, & ἕκαστος ἐκ τῶν αἰώνων ἡ
αἰώνων, ἀμήν. The Trinity is really
perfect, the Father perfect, the Son
perfect, the Holy Ghost perfect; one
Divine Nature, one God, to whom
be Glory, Honour and Dominion for
ever and ever. Amen.

A Post

348
~~The Trinity is really~~
~~one Father, one Son, and one~~
~~Holy Ghost, not three~~
~~Persons, but one Divine~~
~~Nature, of God, to whom~~
~~all Honour and Dominion~~
~~be ascribed for ever~~
POSTSCRIPT

TO THE
AUTHOR
OF THE
TRACT,
ENTITLED,

*A Designed End to the Socinian Con-
troversie.*

SIR,

IF you really have, what Men do
generally pretend, any considerable
Value for your own Immortal Soul,
take heed of *Blasphemy* against the *Son*,
but *especially* against the *Spirit* of God;
for

for that is a Crime *already* pronounced to be irremissible. Take heed of persisting in your present *Heretical* Opinion, denying the Deity of those two glorious Persons, to whom the Scriptures do ascribe such Titles, such Attributes, and such Operations, as are peculiar and proper to God alone. When St. John saith, *The word was God*, and proves it thus; *By him all things were made*, when St. Paul styles our Saviour, *God blessed for ever*, and elsewhere ascribes to him the Creation of the Universe; nay, when God the Father saith to his Son, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*: Why should you, in a flat contradiction to these and other plain Texts, deny his Divinity?

And when St. John tells us, *The word was made Flesh*, and St. Paul saith, *God was manifested in the Flesh*; and again, *He took upon him the Seed of Abraham*, when the Scriptures call our Saviour sometimes *God*, and sometimes *Man*; why should you deny the Union of the Divine and Humane Natures in his sacred Person? How they should be United, you cannot imagine; what then? will you deny the Union of your *own* flesh

flesh and Spirit; because you cannot tell by what *ties* and *bonds* they are linked and knit together: there are many things even in Nature, which were they not visible to the Eye of Man, his *Reason* might well judge to be *impossible*; can you tell me, how a Child is so curiously framed in its Mother's Womb, how it breaths within that narrow Cloister, and how it is nourished there: can you give your self a satisfactory Account, how a Chick with Flesh, Bones, Bill, Claws, and Feathers should be produced out of the same Egg: what sufficient reason can you offer for the variety of smells in plants, and of delicate Colours in one and the same Flower? *Aristotle*, that great Philosopher, ὁ τῆς φύσεως μυστήριος, the grand Secretary, and Interpreter of Nature's Mysteries, was even confounded in his thoughts about the Motions of *Euripus*. And if the Secrets of Nature do thus puzzle the Reason of Man, how can we hope thoroughly to understand *ἡ βάσις τῶν θεῶν*, the deep things of God: the Mysteries of his Nature and his Religion.

I am

I am apt to think, that the Doctrine of the *Trinity* is as easie to Humane Reason, as that of God's *Self-existence*, *Eternity*, *Immensity*, and *Omnipresence*; indeed, that there must be one self-existent Being without a beginning, our own Reason is able to convince us; but *how* it should be so, it can never tell us. That Man must needs be lost in his Meditations, whose thoughts should pursue and dwell upon the Contemplation of *Eternity*; a *Nunc stans*, a *standing*, and perpetual moment, a continued space without Succession. Nor could we frame unto our selves any better Idea's of God's *Immensity* and *Omnipresence* without extension. It was well observed by *Tertullian*, *scrutator Majestatis opprimetur à gloria*. He that shall dive too far into the Infinite Perfections of God, will quickly find himself at a loss and overwhelmed. So it was with *Simonides*, who being asked by *Hiero*, King of *Sicily*, *Quid & qualis Deus sit*, what God is, desired at first one Day, then two, and afterwards many more, to consider of it; and at last, after a long deliberation, told the King thus; *Quanto diutius cogito, tanto mihi res videtur obscurior*. Coel. Rhodig. Antiq. lect. l. 21. c. 34.

Plato a-
pud Cosl.
Rhod. lib.

scurior. The more I consider the Nature of God, the less do I apprehend it. And for this reason did Plato stile God ἀψιντος, ἀνεξέρχουτος, an ineffable Being, one whose Nature no Name can express; and withal he tells us, Οὐδὲ εὐχεῖν ἔστι πάδιν, νόστον δὲ ἀδύνατον, it is no easie thing to find out the True God, but fully to understand him it is impossible.

But although the short-sighted Eye of Humane Reason can never take a full view of the Divine Nature, and its Infinite Perfections, its Self-existence, its Eternity, its Immensity and Omnipresence; yet these Attributes being declared in the Holy Scriptures, we do generally pretend to believe them, though we cannot comprehend them, and why then should you not believe the *Trinity* too? for, sure it is, that those Texts, which prove these Infinite Perfections, which pass Man's understanding, to be found in the Divine Nature, are not more express and plain, than those which prove a *Trinity* of Persons in the Godhead.

And

And let our *Socinians* take heed of deceiving themselves and others, by saying that those Texts, which assert the *Divinity* of Christ and the *Holy Ghost*, are *improper* expressions, and must be *figuratively* understood. Take heed of forcing those Scriptures from their *literal* meaning; which cannot with any tolerable Sense, bear any *other*. So to do was the Practice of Ancient *Hereticks*, ἐβλάμηνοντες τρέποντες καὶ λατρεύοντες, ye have made bold to invent to your selves *Tropes* and *Figures*. This they did to serve a turn, to this sorry shift they were driven by necessity, because they had no other way to escape the force of those Texts, which were urged against them.

Athan. ad
Serap. Sp.
S. non offe
Creat. P.
181.

But let me advise you not to exalt *Humane Reason* too high, and *degrade* the word of God too low; submit your *own* Understanding to *Divine* Revelation; dare not any more charge those Doctrines with *Contradiction* and *Impossibilities*, which the Scriptures teach us for certain *Truths*; say not this or that *cannot* be, when God, who cannot lye, hath told us, that

A a so

so it is. Suppose that none of us were able to answer the subtile Reasonings of *Arius*, *Eunomius*, *Macedonius*, *Socinus*, or our modern *Unitarians*, against the Doctrine of the *Trinity*; yet were we obliged to believe its Truth; because the Scriptures deliver it in such Terms, as are very Intelligible, exprets, plain, and cannot fairly be otherwise understood And since 'tis certainly so, I must tell all the opposers of this Doctrine, what *Epiphanius* told the *Hereticks* of his time, Ἀληθεύουσιν οἱ Ἀπόστολοι, καὶ οἱ προφῆται, ἡμῖν ὑμεῖς καὶ ὁ ὑμεῖν διδάσκαλος; and again, πάντα ἀληθεύει ἡ γὰρ γραφή. The *Apostles* and *Prophets*, being inspired Persons, deserve far greater Credit, than any of those Men, who have been either the *Founders* or the *Promoters* of such Opinions, as contradict those Doctrines, which the *Prophets* and *Apostles* have taught us. The *Scripture*, being a *Divine* Revelation, and well understood, can never deceive us; but *Humane Reason*, being now corrupted and dark'ned, may easily fail us, and often doth so; and in nothing

Epiph. in
Ancor. Sect.
63. p. 66.

nothing more, than in matters of Religion.

Epiphanius hath left us a Catalogue of Eighty Heresies, and St. Austin of Ninety one, and whence all these arise, Epiphanius tells us, Αἵρεσιν καὶ κακοδοσίαις γνώμης ὑπὸ πειλαυημένων ἀνδρῶν ἐν κόσμῳ διαρρέουσας, &c. Heresies and Heterodox Opinions were broached and spread in the World by the mistakes of Men, whose Understandings did miserably deceive them.

Aug. adv. Hær. T. 6. p. 8.
Epiphan. adv. Hær. l. 1. Sect. 2.

Upon which account I would recommend to this Author that advice of Solomon, *Lean not to thy own understanding*, and as to the Interpretation of such and such Texts, prefer not the private Opinions of a few particular Men, above the General Judgment of the Catholick Church.

Prov. 3. 5.

And since in contradiction to the Faith of the Universal Church, grounded upon plain Texts, you flatly deny the Divinity of Christ, and the Personality of the Holy Ghost; be advised

vised to inform your self better ; and to that end, read and weigh Bishop *Pearson's* most rational and learned Exposition of the *Apostle's Creed* ; consider his Arguments, as if (as I am confident) neither you, nor any of your opinion can *confute* them ; be so far *convinced* by them, as to renounce your present Heresie, and to repent that you have endeavoured to promote it by publishing false pretences of Scripture and Humane Reason, thereby to corrupt the minds of *Ignorant* and too *credulous* Men.

And now for a farewell, let me recommend to you that Counsel of the *Roman Orator*. *Artem, quam quisque novit, eam exerceat*, and those vulgar Proverbial Speeches, *Nē sutor ultra crepidam*, and *Tractent fabrilis fabri*, since the Wisdom of Nations is said to lie much in their *Proverbs*, it will be your Prudence to govern your self by these ; the meaning whereof is this, That every Man should exercise that Art only, which he well understands ; that a Shoemaker should not presume to go beyond his Last ; that a Smith should deal

deal with those Materials and Tools only, which are proper for his Vocation. And since your Name is *Smith*, and, as I am credibly informed, your *Employment*, being that of a *Clock-maker*, is somewhat suitable thereunto; you may do well to lay aside the Use of *Pen, Ink, and Paper*, in order to the writing of *Books*; and to take up the *Hammer*, or use the *Anvil*; to mind the *Springs, Wheels, and Movements* of your *Clocks*; to leave the Interpretation of *Scriptures*, and the Decision of *Controversies*, to learned Men, who are able to manage them a great deal better.

But now, for a Close of all, let me tell you, *I am not your Enemy, because I tell you the Truth*; but remembering that of *Tertullian, Verè Christianus nemini inimicus*, I am an Enemy to *no Man's Person*, and consequently not to *yours*; but withal, remembering that of the Apostle, *Contend earnestly for the Faith*. To every Man's *Heretical Opinion*, and therefore to *yours*, I am an Enemy, and ought to be so. The grand Articles
of

of our Christian Faith, relating to the *Deity* of *Christ* and his *Holy Spirit*, plainly delivered in several Texts, and generally professed by the best and most Divines of the Catholick Church, being now unworthily opposed by Men who measure the Infinite Perfections of God by the Imperfect Scantlings of Humane Reason; I would defend with my *Pen*, and if need were, ought to seal them with my *Blood*,

In the mean time, I will venture to tell you, that if our *Trinitarians* cannot give a *fairer* Answer to all those Texts, which in your opinion, contradict the Doctrine of the Trinity, than any of your *Unitarians* can give to those many Texts, which in our Judgment do clearly prove it. I will renounce my present Faith, and become your Proselyte, and own my self to be, though as yet I think I never shall be, a *Socinian*. To make me a Man of that opinion, the reasonings of Man's fallible Understanding will not be sufficient; but several Texts must either be proved to be *no part* of the *Canon*, and blotted out of our Bibles; or else they must be more *fairly interpreted* some

some other way, than as yet they ever have been. But to expunge any part of the Scripture, were grossly *impious* and sacrilegious; to expound any Text contrary to the received Sence of the *Universal Church*, were very highly *assuming*; to imagine *Tropes* and *Figures*, where the *literal* Sence is plain, easie, and very consonant to the Analogy of Faith, what were this; but, *Nodum in Scirpo quarere*? to seek and pretend Difficulties, where indeed there are none? what were this; but, with *Origen*, to turn the *plain* letter into *Allegory*? This is the Course, which *Hereticks* have been wont to take, that they might elude the sacred Writ, and force the *good word* of God to serve the *ill opinions* of Men.

F I N I S.